

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. II

AUGUST, 1901

No. 2

Tolstoy and Socialism



WHEN social evils reach such a stage that they commence to threaten the existing order, vague discontent and general criticism begin to give place to constructive thought, to the formation of new ideals and standards of life, which find their expression in two distinct movements different in character. The classes of society who are personally affected by the evils demand the abolition of an order which they have come to recognize as unjust through materialistic-utilitarian reasons. Hence these constitute the fundamental principle of their movement.

Those members of the upper classes who become aware of the existing injustice do not themselves experience its evil effects, but attain consciousness of it only through moral self-analysis, which reveals them as participators in the injustice, consequently, guilty of it. For this reason progressive movements among the upper classes assume an idealistic-ethical character, and the ideological principle is considered by them fundamental to progress.

The outcome of such an idealistic movement will be fruitful or futile, according to the course it follows. If its representatives perceive the trend of evolution, if they keep in close touch with the actual conditions and always feel the pulse of the living social organism, their efforts must necessarily coincide with the wide movement of the suffering masses, must strengthen it and bear fruit. But if, in pursuing a goal which they deem desirable, they attempt to revive past ideals and haughtily ignore the conditions that make these ideals historically impossible, then the noblest aspirations are doomed to futility. Past experience, it seems, should tell them that their efforts are vain. But experience counts for naught with visionaries, if only they find the phantom attractive. They cheerfully

pursue it and, determined to turn the tide of history, leap—in the imagination—over unsurmountable barriers of accumulated facts.

The mightiest effort of this kind in our days is undoubtedly Tolstoyism.

Tolstoy stands alone in our age. He is not only the greatest Russian novelist, but is almost universally acknowledged pre-eminent among the novelists of the century. Although twenty years ago he recanted his former conceptions of art and devoted himself to a different activity, Tolstoy continued from time to time to produce new undying artistic works. Recently "Resurrection" gave fresh proof that the genius of the author of "War and Peace" had little if at all declined with age.

Yet strange as it may seem, Tolstoy did not gain his world-wide renown through his works of fiction. His name became famous at the time when he renounced his former beliefs, and conceived a new ideal of life, founded on a new philosophy, a new religion, and a new science. Since then he has incessantly worked to rouse the conscience of men, to show them the absurd contradictions in our social order, the cruelty and injustice of the "Slavery of Our Times," and in his analysis and description of social conditions has exposed with striking force the lies of modern civilization. So far Tolstoy is a mighty warrior in the ever-increasing army arrayed against the old system. However, Tolstoy does not confine himself to criticism. He also proposes methods of uprooting the evils and suggests plans for the reconstruction of the social edifice. It is in regard to these methods and plans that Tolstoy not only differs from the socialists, but inevitably conflicts with them.

Now, however perverted his propositions may seem, it must be remembered that Tolstoy is a leading object of public attention and exerts a powerful influence. Therefore it seems proper to analyze his teachings and consider their relation to socialist philosophy.

Tolstoy, despairing of the possibility of scientific progress to abolish misery, turns his eyes to the past and finds in the teachings of Christ the all-sufficing means for the salvation of mankind. He does not recognize the evolutionary principle by which a brighter future can be founded only on present economic development. Instead of science, which he thinks bankrupt, he substitutes faith. "I believe in the doctrine of Christ and found my salvation in it," is in one form or another the constant refrain of all his reasonings, whatever subject he touches. All his teachings are but unavoidable corollaries of this fundamental premise. He thus disposes of all the vital problems of the day by means of the New Testament—an apocryphal book dating back nearly two thousand years. Whether we consider him as a philosopher, as a moralist or as

a social reformer, we shall always come to this point of departure—the gospel, or rather a number of its propositions pronounced as infallible articles of faith. This certainly lends homogeneity to his system, so that no one of his propositions can be detached from the whole. Therefore they all stand or fall together. They must either be all accepted or all rejected. If based on a valid foundation this fact must become a source of strength; if on an illusion, it is the cause of their weakness.

Tolstoy sees the highest mode of life in the fulfilment of the primitive Christian ideal and the pursuit of a land-tiller. But to make agriculture possible for all, the land must be restored to the people. In this restoration consists the solution of the social problem. Hence his half-hearted adhesion to Henry George—half-hearted because Tolstoy's teachings exclude the possibility of applying the single-tax method, which involves coercion, state administration and laws.

Most of the manufactured products, he holds, must be renounced, because they satisfy needs that grew out of the pursuit of pleasure, and in fact he would give up everything but what is indispensable to a mere existence, the object of which is the attainment of a certain abstract aim. "The eternal and highest aim of our life is good. . . . and life is nothing but a striving for good, i. e., a striving for God." This sounds well, but it ought to be remembered that not in life itself, i. e., not in the gladness of mere existence is where Tolstoy discerns the good, but in a transcendental principle, which is to be carried out by the renunciation of worldly enjoyment.

Thus the aim of life announced by Tolstoy is asceticism. Asceticism is the clue to all of Tolstoy's social philosophy, and once found, it becomes the criterion by which every phenomenon is measured and estimated, and upon which is based the solution of every question. Before the impartial tribunal of this doctrine all the integral elements of civilization—philosophy, science, art and industry—are found equally guilty and doomed to extermination. All philosophy is declared to be a texture of metaphysical cobwebs; August Comte's proposition that ours is the age of science receives a scornful sneer; art based on the validity of beauty as the source of enjoyment is sinful, and industry producing articles that increase human needs and foster new desires is also sinful in itself and moreover divers men from the pursuit of God's law.

It has often been suggested that the key to these singular teachings of Tolstoy must be sought in the depths of the Russian national spirit, in the peculiarities of its soul. This is true in a certain sense—in which sense can perhaps be seen best from the following statements taken from his writings:

"Like the thief on the cross, I, too, believed in the doctrine of Christ, and found my salvation in it. This is not a far-

fetches comparison; it worthily describes the condition of anguish and despair I was once in at the thought of life and of death, and it also indicates the peace and happiness which now fill my soul."

"I believe that true happiness will only be possible when all men begin to follow Christ's doctrine. I believe that, even if it be left unfulfilled by all around me. . . . *I cannot do otherwise than follow it, in order to save my own life from inevitable destruction.*" ("What I Believe.")

To one familiar with Russian life and literature these words strike a familiar note. They re-echo the struggles of a self-analyzing soul striving to find its own equilibrium. A predisposition for internal scrutiny is strongly developed in the Russian intellectual forming a marked part of his character. Russia knows a number of its remarkable men who solved the problem of their inner mental discord each in his own way, but always abnormally—Gogol, Dostoyevsky, Garshin.

From the passage cited above, the sentiment of which is with slight variations often repeated in his works of the latter period, we see that what led Tolstoy to the gospels was not so much the solution their teachings offered to the complex knot of modern problems, but that it was above all the "peace and happiness" with which these teachings "fill the soul" of the peasant-count. It must be remembered, however, that Tolstoy does not propose that man content himself with the gospel's wisdom and sit inactive and be blessed. We know that the last twenty years of his life, rich in works of love to his fellow-men, are a repudiation of this. But it naturally leads to the conclusion that the principal aim of the individual is to strive for inward peace. He who has found this peace has attained the kingdom of heaven, for "the kingdom of heaven is within us," contends Tolstoy, accepting Christ's saying literally. As to the poor and destitute, they must wait until the wealthy and powerful shall have become enlightened by the gospel of truth and ashamed of living by their blood and sweat. He seems quite unconscious of the inconsistency when in another place he concedes that "the capitalists will do everything for the workers except get off their backs."

To advocate non-resistance and expect salvation exclusively from individual moral consciousness is possible only to one who assumes human nature to be immutable, believes in its inherent goodness and in free will, i. e., in men's capacity to think and wish with absolute freedom, regardless of all the conditions and environment that determine his conscious being. As, however, inherent good-naturedness and free will are not philosophical principles but theological dogmas, a doctrine based on them cannot but be opposed to the deterministic phi-

losophy of socialism, which founds its teachings on evolution and science.

The way toward a solution of the social problem, toward a realization of a more perfect social ideal based on science is certainly intricate and beset with errors and false conceptions whose elimination from the truth is necessarily a long, gradual and painful process. It winds in zigzags, sometimes seemingly leading astray, backward or even into a maze, and to follow it is often very wearisome. It is therefore natural for an impatient mind passionately seeking for complete and immediate truth to look back upon the simple wisdom of the ingenuous carpenter of Nazareth as upon the only infallible way out of the sombre wood of modern civilization. Tolstoy does not recognize that the Christian teaching based on an anti-biological and anti-natural self-renunciation, could not as a social factor but degenerate into the monstrous lie of official Christendom. He practically proposes to try it all over again.

The incongruity of his ascetic propaganda becomes still more glaring when it is recalled that as an agnostic Tolstoy does not bother about the life beyond the grave, but strives to bring about the happiness of men on earth. While the moral sense of a believer in future retribution may logically be completely satisfied with the Christian doctrine of renunciation, it is strange for a non-believer in revelation to discern in it a basis of practical morality. No one denies the exalted nobility of the golden rule or still more of the saying, "Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek turn to him the other also." It is a lofty ideal of moral perfection. But who can for a moment seriously consider it as a basis for regulating human life relations?

Buckle somewhere in his "History of Civilization" points out that a few ethical propositions known for thousands of years had been adopted and assimilated by all the great religions of the world without having undergone any substantial change, save for a few slight variations in form. "Do to others as ye would that they should do to you" is the rule to which the ethics of all great religions and systems can be reduced. This rule had been taught for ages in all forms and languages without having produced the desired effect, and continues a perpetual commonplace void of all significance if taken independently of existing relations. All the attained improvements in manners, morals and refinement of feeling can, on the contrary, be traced in the industrial and intellectual development of society which determine the moral code of a given age. Chattel slavery began to be considered immoral not before it had been outgrown by all the conditions that constitute an environment, chiefly by the economic progress. To the noble-minded Plato it did not even occur that slavery might be a discord in the harmony

of his "Republic." The suggestion that slavery was incompatible with "equality" and "justice," the two fundamental elements of his ideal state, would have seemed to him as absurd as that of granting equal rights to domestic animals.

Tolstoy not only founds his teachings upon an abstract principle, but without criticism accepts as eternal truths all the precepts alleged to have been uttered by Christ. As has been remarked, this gives homogeneity to his system, but, on the other hand, leads him to queer contradictions. He repudiates metaphysics, discerning its pernicious influence even in theoretical deductions from concrete social and economic phenomena, and yet himself writes a work in elucidation of the gospels* which is but metaphysics simplified. He certainly endeavors to put in them a plain meaning, but does not see that the very possibility of so many interpretations, often mutually exclusive of each other, points to metaphysical confusion. He ignores the fact that every one reads in the Bible his own mind, and that a certain crafty set of sophisters even contrive to find in it the justification of all the atrocities he condemns. He denounces Kant, Schopenhauer and particularly Hegel, whose doctrine he mockingly labels "the philosophy of the spirit," while he himself bases human progress on an "inborn religious sense." But is not an "inborn religious sense" developing independently of all material relations strikingly similar to a self-sufficient "absolute idea"? Tolstoy merely limits its application to the human race.

For all vital problems Tolstoy offers final categorical solutions based upon or, at least, in strict conformity with the same source—the New Testament. On it he founds his attitude as to science, art, industry, social relations, relations of sexes, and every other factor of modern culture. As regards science he has a contempt not only for what is designated social science—philosophy, history, sociology, political economy—but includes under his ban also biological and the greater part of positive science. "Medicine is a false science," with all its adjunct branches, of course. Of positive science he would retain only what is immediately useful. He denies the utility of all knowledge that has no immediate practical purpose, as astronomy, higher mathematics, etc., and repudiates all research not actuated by a definite utilitarian object. Research for the sake of truth in itself is said to be a fruitless waste of time and energy and those who indulge in it are idlers that seek the mere satisfaction of their fancies. He seems not to comprehend the primary truth that it is not the search for useful inventions that leads thinkers to the inquiry and discovery of nature's laws, but vice versa. In consonance with these

* "My Religion,"

views he does not care to popularize science, as the people, he contends, are not in need of it. The only knowledge they require is the "genuine" knowledge taught by Confucius, Buddha, Moses, Mohammed and, above all, Jesus, of how to live morally. But in condemning science he condemns that which brings light and warmth to the human race. It appeared to him impotent and worthless because it did not answer his transcendental questions as to the aim of life. Its plain contention that the aim of life is in life itself, i. e., in enjoying it, and that, in this sense, science constantly amplifies it, he ridicules, scoffing at an ideal of the civilized world in which "machines will do all the work and men will be but enjoying bundles of nerves." It is contrary to his asceticism indeed.

It is this asceticism also that determines his conceptions of art. In the pamphlet "What Is Art" Tolstoy, with remarkable force, attempts to prove that nearly everything generally understood as art is not worthy of the name and is false art. Here, as everywhere, the indictment against the curse of commercialism and intellectual corruption poisoning the artistic spirit in capitalist society is masterly. "So long as the traders will not be driven out of the temple, the temple of art will be no temple." ("What Is Art.") But Tolstoy does not content himself with the denunciation of the monstrous outgrowths of modern decadence. In his destructive rage he does away with Shakespeare, Milton, Michael Angelo, Beethoven, Raphael, Goethe, all because the avowed object of their art-productions is the expression of beauty, conveying enjoyment, and is therefore contrary to his life principle. Only those art-productions that have nothing but a moral object are "genuine" art-productions. His ideal of art, as of everything else, lies not in future development, but in the past simple and even barbaric stage of society. Its criterion is its comprehensibility for the untrained mind. He overlooks that this inevitably leads to a complete negation of art. "My own art productions I reckon within the province of bad art with the exception of 'God Sees the Truth' and 'The Caucasian Prisoner,'" (Ibid.) It is scarcely conceivable that this assertion should come from the very depths of a firm conviction, and is rather to be regarded as a conclusion Tolstoy forced upon himself in strict accord with the whole of his teachings.

To what lengths of absurdity Tolstoy is led by constantly following out his ascetic doctrine is best demonstrated by his views on one of the most important social functions—the relations between man and woman. On this point not much need be said here. The philosophy of his "Kreutzer Sonata" is sufficiently known. In all his subsequent productions he zealously maintains the essential principles of the "Kreutzer

Sonata." Their chief feature is the mortification of the flesh: "Life dwells in the spirit, in the flesh is death. The life of the spirit is goodness and light: the life of the flesh is evil and darkness." The sexual instinct is regarded as an "imaginary want" not in reality existent. Upon cohabitation, whether legal or not, he looks as upon a hindrance to higher spiritual life. If a man and woman do have conjugal intercourse they must be bound to each other forever and produce children without limit regardless of their means of subsistence, for otherwise, he says, "men would be delivered from the cares and pains of rearing them up, which are the retribution of carnal love." He urges women to give up the folly of striving for science, education, and, if married, to exclusively devote themselves to the bearing and rearing of children; this is their destiny, because "such is the law of God to Moses, and it cannot be transgressed with impunity." Tolstoy realizes that sinful man will not so readily acquiesce in the opinion that one of the most powerful instincts of life is an imaginary one, and he makes a slight concession declaring that absolute chastity is an ideal which is worth striving for, as it would enable men to realize the law of life, which consists in disinterested love to each other. He seems not even to suspect the kinship between sexual and altruistic love, which has long ago attracted the attention of biologists. One of them in a recent work* conclusively establishes the fact that the benevolent sentiments originate directly from the sympathy of the male to the female, which then gradually extends to their immediate offspring, family, group, clan, community, etc. Thus, far from thwarting mutual sympathy among men, the sexual instinct is to be regarded as the primitive cause of this feeling. Contempt for science will spare Tolstoy the cheerless recognition of the fact that his propaganda of abstinence deprives his abstract altruism of any foundation.

These being essentially the fundamental principles of Tolstoy's teachings, it is now superfluous to draw a parallel between them and the socialist conception. The difference so obviously appears from the foregoing review that it would necessarily be a repetition. There now remains to be outlined the practical inferences of Tolstoy's philosophy with regard to the emancipation movement of the workers, and the more specific charges Tolstoy makes against socialism.

Tolstoy agrees with socialists precisely as much as socialists agree with him, i. e., in the indictment against the present system. For the rest they are entirely at variance, and Tolstoy on many occasions gave expression to this antagonism. What must be considered his most complete and direct at-

* Alexander Sutherland: "The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct," 2 vols., London, 1898.

tack on socialism appeared in a pamphlet published about a year ago,* in which we find a special chapter devoted to exposing "The Bankruptcy of the Socialist Ideal." Let us say right here that were it not for the name of Tolstoy the attack it contains could be passed over without a word. The promisingly sounding title naturally suggests a heavy armory of elaborate arguments arrayed for the overthrow of the principal tenets of the socialist philosophy, to-wit: The materialistic conception of history, the theory of class-struggles, the analysis of the mechanism of capitalist production and the theory of value. But whoever expects a single word with regard to all these propositions, which to ignore and at the same time to destroy socialism seems to be unthinkable, will be thoroughly disappointed. Tolstoy evidently includes them in the general anathema of science and therefore deems a separate refutation superfluous. But then, it seems, he should not have thought it worth his while to expound the "Bankruptcy of the Socialist Ideal," since the latter is based on premises already done away with.

Let us consider his objections. Having repudiated the economists for their attempts to infer laws of industrial development and their assertion, "that rural laborers must enter the factory system," he contends that not private ownership of capital and land is the cause of labor's destitution, "but that which drives them from the villages." He further says: "The emancipation of the workers from the state of things (even in the distant future in which science promises them liberty) can be accomplished neither by shortening the hours of labor, nor by increasing wages, nor by the promised communalization of the means of production. All that can not improve their position, for the misery of the laborer's position . . . consists not in the longer or shorter hours of work, nor does it consist in the low rate of wages, nor in the fact that the railway or the factory is not theirs, but it consists in the fact that they are obliged to work in harmful, unnatural conditions often dangerous and destructive to life, and to live a barrack life in towns—a life full of temptations and immorality—and to do compulsory labor at another's bidding."† In other words: the misery of the laborer's position consists not in long hours and low wages, but in "harmful, unnatural conditions often dangerous and destructive to life;" not in the fact that the means of production are not theirs, but in the fact that they have to do "compulsory labor at another's bidding,"—as if those who strive to obtain shorter hours and higher wages do so for the abstract liking of short hours and high wages and

* "The Slavery of Our Times."

† "The Slavery of Our Times," pp. 86-87.

not for the sake of removing "harmful conditions;" as if socialists proposed collectivism not to abolish "compulsory labor at another's bidding," but because *communalization* spelled differently, *private ownership*!

Tolstoy reproaches socialists that they wish to perpetuate the causes that drive the peasants from the villages and "think it better for people to live in towns and to do compulsory machine work in factories rather than to live in villages and to work freely."* This is utterly false. On the contrary, socialists recognize the causes that under the present system drive peasants into the industrial slavery of towns and direct all their efforts towards bringing about a state of things which will abolish the contrast of town and country. In the above assertion the arbitrary interpretation of the socialist theory is so obvious that it needs no further discussion.

"But even allowing this assertion . . . there remains in the very ideal itself, to which the men of science tell us the economic revolution is leading, an insoluble contradiction."† The contradiction which Tolstoy discerns in the socialist ideal is fourfold: First, how decide the length of time each man is to work, since the production must be apportioned? Second, "how are people to be induced to work at articles which some consider necessary and others consider unnecessary and even harmful?" Third, "which men are to do which work? Everybody will evidently prefer to do the light and pleasant work." And last, how will the degree of division of labor be regulated? These are essentially his objections to the socialist ideal. What they evince in the first place is that their author has not thought it worth his while to study or read socialist literature. And even if so, it is only blind predisposition that could make it possible to consider such naive objections as material. Moreover, even were they justified they could be disregarded, since socialism is not a scheme but a stage of economic evolution which is inevitable and must follow competition and private monopoly regardless of individual preferences. But socialists can afford to be generous and remove the scarecrows of a frightened imagination.

How long each man is to work and how the degree of division of labor will be regulated are questions that do not press for immediate settlement. When the world will be confronted with them it will have no difficulty in coping with these problems according to prevailing conditions. This will be the easier, inasmuch as the principal industries shall have been to a very great extent socialistically organized before they will be communalized. Nor need there be one central

* "Slavery of Our Times," p. 55.

† Ibid.

industrial administration over the whole globe. It is natural to suppose that the socialist state will form a confederacy of industrial republics, larger or smaller, in accordance with local conditions. As to production of articles which some may consider unnecessary or harmful, it is enough to say here that there is no reason to think why Tolstoy, for instance, would be compelled to work in a distillery or a butcher-shop if he is a vegetarian. In general, compulsion can hardly be spoken of in a co-operative society, where no one would have to be subjected to authority and each would be obliged to do his share of work in order to satisfy his own needs. What concerns unpleasant and hard work, there will not be much of it in a society with a high stage of technique and without profit-seeking as the only motive in industry. It should also be remembered that the modern cant of the "dignity of labor," in which wealthy idlers so much indulge, will necessarily become a truth in a commonwealth based on the co-operative labor of all. Besides, it may be conjectured that those who will do harder and more unpleasant work will work less. All these objections are especially strange as coming from Tolstoy, who professes so much confidence in the altruistic nature of men. He, more than anyone else, should have made allowance for the prevalence of this feeling in a society where all are economically safe.

It cannot be expected that these plain answers would satisfy Tolstoy or any other apostle of non-resistance. It is in the nature of things that a believer in free will should also believe in "absolute" freedom. He will therefore discern coercion in every natural obligation resulting from communal life and labor, forgetting that "absolute" freedom can be but an ideal and will never become an "absolute" reality, since one man's freedom must end where another's begins.

Now, what does Tolstoy offer instead of socialism? His propositions to the world's workers can be inferred from the foregoing elucidation of his views. He repudiates Malthus, of course, but by his teachings on sexual relations practically proposes to the workingman Malthusianism, leaving him no other choice than to altogether abstain or to starve himself by producing a large family. It makes no difference to the laborer that Malthus was actuated in his proposition by his economic class-interest, or Tolstoy by a would-be moral principle. His views on art, science and industry evince a tendency not to increase the worker's share of enjoyment in them, but to reduce the higher classes to their primitive level, or lower still. According to him, one of the causes of evil lies in the too highly developed wants of the proletariat, while socialism sees in their low standard of life, in "*der verdammten Bedurfmislosigkeit der Massen*," an obstruction to their cultural

progress. Together with the rotten fruits of civilization he rejects all the fresh and nourishing ones, whose cultivation took thousands of years and were raised by mankind at the expense of its blood and sweat. Socialists will retain all that is worth having, for it is folly to suppose that the human race will renounce all that has been acquired by its geniuses. Some of Tolstoy's propositions have some positive meaning for the propertied classes: renunciation of their wealth, moral regeneration; but for the toiler who has nothing to renounce, they remain high-sounding Christian sermons void of inner significance. He tells him to be patient and wait until his oppressors shall become pervaded with Christian love and ideas of the happiness of ascetic life and agricultural labor. Still better, if the workingman realizes that the "kingdom of heaven is within us," then he would become happy in his mundane misery and free in his bonds. Tolstoy had no right to scoff at the metaphysicians who declared that the only actual freedom is that of the spirit. This is indeed the only logical result of his teaching of non-resistance so far as the "modern slaves" are concerned. The doctrine of non-resistance, convenient as it is to all kinds of oppression, is the culminating point of his reactionary tendencies. It would enervate and emasculate labor and render it the perpetual prey of the exploiters. Like the church it actually preaches subjection, with the difference that the church does it in the name of future retribution, and Tolstoy in the name of morality. Tolstoy hates war and strife. So do socialists. But while Tolstoy would have peace even at the price of liberty, socialists prefer war for freedom to the peace of slavery. Tolstoy's philosophy involves quietism and, if accepted, would lead to intellectual apathy and stagnation. Socialism based on evolutionary science means development and progress. Fortunately, the unreasonableness of Tolstoyism is so manifest to plain common sense that its influence need not be feared. In its unceasing forward movement the human race with unerring instinct borrows from its thinkers only what it can assimilate in its historic evolution. It was thus France acted with regard to Jean Jacques Rousseau—Tolstoy's great prototype of the eighteenth century. When Rousseau sent Voltaire a copy of his famous prize essay on the causes of inequality among men,* in which he eloquently depicted the evils of civilization and recommended that humanity should return to nature and to the simple life of primitive men, the patriarch of Farney acknowledged the gift in a courteous letter, where he remarks with fine irony: "You may please men by telling them the

* "Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité des conditions parmi les hommes."

truth about them, but you would not make them better. It would be impossible to paint the horrors of human society in stronger colors than you did. No one ever displayed so much intelligence striving to make us stupid; reading your book one is overtaken by a desire of crawling on his fours. However, as it is more than sixty years since I lost this habit, I unfortunately feel that it will be impossible for me to return to it."*

France of the great revolution, so vigorously promoted by the negative analysis of Rousseau's genius, has together with Voltaire declined his positive proposals and did not return to the age of crawling on fours. Nor will our age of a still greater and more thorough revolution renounce its manhood and return to its primitive stage by adopting the beliefs and ideals of Tolstoy's ascetic Christianity. Still, as in the case of Rousseau, the great social forces of the coming revolution will hail with gratitude the marvelous work Tolstoy is doing in uprooting the pillars of bourgeois society. Future generations will study Tolstoy the artist; but his teachings will probably in due time be forgotten by the bulk of the civilized world. Tolstoy will survive Tolstoyism.

B. H. Brumberg.

* Voltaire, *Oeuvres complètes*. Paris, 1824-1832, LXXVI., 112 et seq.



French Socialism and the Lyons Congress

THE comrades abroad will have some difficulty in understanding French socialism. It is a veritable chaos of whirling groups, sections and sub-sections that enter into alliances, fight one another and combine under the most varying and unexpected forms. And as the cause and at the same time the effect of this unceasing division of the socialist forces in France, we find personal disputes, fights of individuals against individuals. However, if we observe more closely and do not simply judge from mere appearances, we easily become aware that personal rivalries are not the only cause of the differences among socialists. Without any doubt, personal differences thrive well in such a disorder, but they alone do not create it. Differences as to tactics and methods also contribute their share, and although they are just as strong in other countries, they are there easily restrained by the reins of a united party. This seems impossible in France, at least for the moment. The whole historical past with its feuds of groups and individuals weighs us down as heavily as the individualism that characterizes our national temperament. All this cannot be abolished in a single day, if it can ever be overcome at all.

This is the lesson taught by the Lyons congress. The elements that were hitherto restrained by factional union, but cannot be assimilated, separated at last from the others and took up their own respective positions. Compulsory marriages always end in divorce.

The French socialists are not yet ripe for unity. Or at best they could have attained only an imperfect unity. Those who wanted to go too fast and make a clean table of it with the old organizations and their historical rights, have compromised everything. The old organizations manifested a growing restlessness in view of the arrival of new elements in the party. They resisted a too hasty union, strengthened their positions and finally detached themselves one by one from the artificial block in order to resume their former independence.

I.

The history of the movement for unity in France is very instructive. In 1893, after pronounced successes in the elections, a considerable number of socialists penetrated into par-

liament. This unforeseen success had somewhat mitigated the old internal feud, and at least on the election ground, face to face with the common enemy, a union was maintained from 1893 to 1898 between the socialist parties: Parti Ouvrier Francais (Jules Guesde), Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire (Vaillant), Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Revolutionnaire (Allemane), Federation des Travailleurs Socialistes de France (Jaures, Millerand, Viviani). This union for election purposes was not always respected. Especially the Allemanists detached themselves or rather never adhered to it properly. But feeble as this union was, it was superior to the disorder and mutual devouring that had previously characterized French socialism.

To push farther ahead the work of the growing union, to make a permanent and organic unity out of this purely momentary alliance on the election ground, this was a thought that strongly appealed to the new men who had come into the party without being linked to its past.

Jaures, who joined the party during the elections of 1893, and became the great parliamentary leader of the legislature from 1893 to 1898, made himself the most ardent advocate of the new idea. The masses who seemed tired of the interminable fights of schools and leaders, welcomed him with joy. And since 1897 a strong movement in favor of unity developed in the deep recesses of French socialism.

It seemed as if this movement were to bear its full fruit, or to yield at least its first results when the passionate discussions provoked by the affaire Dreyfus threatened to break up everything. It is well known that, while Jaures displayed a prominent activity, the old parties—the Parti Ouvrier Francais of Jules Guesde and the Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire of Vaillant—refrained from all intervention and severely denounced the course of Jaures who, by the way, did not have all the independent parties on his side at the outset. We have not yet forgotten the vigorous polemics that stirred up all the French socialists during 1898, especially after the legislative elections, and during the year 1899.

However, from the excess of evil the remedy was to come. In view of the daily more threatening menace of militarism and clericalism, the disruption of the socialist forces constituted a grave danger. The force of the circumstances was stronger than all resistance, and if we wished to oppose the reactionary elements we had to unite. Unity first came in its most elementary form. On the initiative of Jules Guesde, a "Vigilance Committee" was created in the latter part of 1898, whose duty, as indicated by the name, was to watch the situation.

The movement for unity gained once more in favor and claimed recognition through the force of circumstances.

This became so apparent that everybody in the party recognized the necessity of calling a general congress of all socialist organizations for the purpose of creating a permanent united organization. The old rudimentary "Vigilance Committee" had already been replaced by a "Committee on Agreement" that by its daily action united more closely all the sections still maintaining their independence in spite of everything. But even this "Committee on Agreement" seemed insufficient, and the congress of 1899 assembled in the Salle Wagram at Paris to devise a more perfect organization.

Unhappily, the Millerand incident once more broke up the ranks of the socialists in June 1899. Mr. Waldeck-Rousseau had formed his cabinet by choosing General de Gallifet and the socialist deputy Millerand. The party was stirred to its depths. The "Cas Millerand" was discussed by the militant socialists under three points of view: 1. As a question of principle: Does the class struggle permit the socialist party to take part at any moment, through the agency of one of its members, in the central power of the bourgeoisie? 2. As a question of tactics: If so, under what conditions is it admissible? Was there any danger of reaction at the moment of the formation of the cabinet? 3. As a question of fact: Has a socialist a right to take a place by the side of General de Gallifet, the murderer of the communists of Paris, even if he could or should enter the cabinet?

The first beginnings of unity just mentioned by us were immediately shattered by these passionate discussions. The Parti Ouvrier Français of Jules Guesde and the Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire of Vaillant issued a scathing manifesto excluding Millerand and his defenders from the party. Their deputies ostentatiously left the parliamentary group of socialists and formed a purely revolutionary group in the Chambre.

The old parties availed themselves the more eagerly of this opportunity to break away from the rest of the party as the advocates of unity; especially Jaures urged the immediate necessity of a complete union. Jaures and his friends demanded the complete absorption of the old organizations and their final fusion into one great united party. The old parties were afraid of such hasty action, rallied among themselves, and when Millerand entered into power without any previous consultation with the party, solely on his personal responsibility, they made this another strong point in their defense.

Amid these stirring scenes the congress of 1899 opened. Nevertheless it brought about some progress, by constituting a

central body for the unification of all socialist parties. It formed a general committee for the permanent representation of the united party. The different organizations were to send a number of delegates proportionate to the number of their mandates. It also recognized the existence of the first autonomous federations, sectional or departmental, whether of older or more recent origin.

This general committee existed until the congress of October, 1900, in Paris. Its role was not brilliant. The elements it harbored in its bosom were deeply hostile to one another, and constant and irreconcilable differences occurred among them. It accomplished no serious and practical results. Its only effect was to render more pointed the troubles between the groups and persons arising from the acts of the ministry Millerand-Waldeck-Rousseau.

Consequently when the International Socialist Congress assembled in September, 1900, the Frenchmen, passionate and divided, forced it to devote itself almost exclusively to the "Cas Millerand." The Kautsky resolution, which was adopted, did not succeed in harmonizing them, and at the national congress that was held a few days later a new schism took place. The Parti Ouvrier Francais bolted and resumed its isolated position. Its ally, the Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire, did not follow. It remained in the Salle Wagram with the secret intention of serving as a bridge between the bolting Parti Ouvrier Francais and the majority of the party.

The national congress of October, 1900, dissolved, charging the new general committee with the preparation of a plan for the complete unification of the party, and with convening a new congress after the lapse of six months, to the end of accomplishing a definite union.

The general committee nominated by the October congress of 1900 prepared a unity program. But the difficulties separating the parties that composed it became more pronounced instead of diminishing. The Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire took part in the deliberations, but in a rather loose manner. In the country, the fighting continued over every act of Millerand. And the differences between the adversaries of ministerialism and its partisans augmented daily. In the beginning, the defenders of Millerand thought of his entry only as being provisional, exceptional and accidental. But when the cabinet lasted, these same defenders made of the participation in the government no longer a question of circumstances, but of a new method of action. This was the cause of all evil. In view of these theoretical affirmations of the ministerialists,

the anti-ministerialists retreated more and more and accentuated their uncompromising attitude to exaggeration.

Hence, at the moment of opening the Lyons Congress (May 26-28), the Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire was attached to the general committee in name only. In heart and spirit it was with the Parti Ouvrier Francais, toward which the actions of the ministerialists removed it more and more.

The resulting schism, unfortunate as it is, was only quite natural. It was a question of making an end to the cause of division. For this purpose the congress had to exhaust for once and all the "Cas Millerand." The attempt was made, but it did not succeed. The Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire, together with the Alliance Communiste (Groussier, Dejeante) and some autonomous federations, cut the last ties that bound them to the rest of the united party. This proved that, for the moment at least, unity of all French socialists is impossible.

We must now turn to the work of the congress itself.

II.

If the congress had adhered to the tenor of the call, it would have discussed only the unity programs submitted to it. Nevertheless, a question of prejudice pre-occupied all minds: to terminate the "Cas Millerand."

The question really imposed itself, so to say. Nobody protested. The discussion was accepted on all sides as necessary. It was well understood that it was useless to formulate unity programs, unless this unity was first made possible, or unless the possibility or impossibility of unity was first ascertained.

The congress was confronted by two resolutions which differed only in one expression: Both of them declared that the French socialists must treat the Waldeck-Rousseau cabinet like all bourgeois cabinets. But the first resolution, that of de la Porte, stated that Millerand had placed himself *outside of the party* by his entry in the cabinet. While the second resolution, that of Briand, said that he had placed himself *outside of the control of the party*. If unity could have been accomplished, it would have done so on one of these two resolutions. To say that one of our members has placed himself *outside of the party* or *outside of the control of the party*—is not that the same thing for us? If a man is *outside of the control of the party*, is he not *outside of the party*?

Because there existed opposite doctrines and tactics that were irreconcilable for the moment and seemed incompatible while Millerand's ministry lasted, therefore no agreement was

possible on any of these resolutions. This became clearly apparent in the course of the discussions, that were particularly violent, abusive and painful. Evidently there was no hope for the organic union of such inimical brothers.

The history of the discussion on the de la Porte motion and later on of the Briand motion is interesting and may explain what happened to those readers who were ill informed by an ill-informed press. The words *outside of the party* in the de la Porte motion were interpreted in the most offensive sense by the defenders of doctrinary ministerialism: they believed that the simple statement of the situation of Millerand in regard to party discipline had the afterthought of excluding from the party those who defended him. And for this personal character, which was attributed to it wholly gratuitously, de la Porte's motion was abandoned by many of its partisans for Briand's motion. If the majority rallied to the support of Briand's motion, it was solely due to these accidental and in no way decisive reasons.

Nevertheless, Briand's motion is a defeat for the convinced ministerialists in spite of its adoption. Briand was careful to point out in his speech that those who had signed his motion had pledged themselves solemnly to avoid in the future all hateful discussions of ministerialism in the party and not to attribute to the existence of the cabinet of Waldeck Rousseau a prime importance for the actions of the socialists.

The Blanquists and a few signers of de la Porte's motion refused to change anything. The terms of the declaration accurately expressed their ideas. Therefore they left the congress when the vote turned out to their disadvantage, and declared that they were unable to further take part in any work with socialists who were so far removed from their principles.

I must mention an incident to which the International Socialist Review had given place. I was one of the signers of de la Porte's motion although after its rejection I supported Briand's motion. Jaures, the leading champion of Millerand, fought de la Porte's motion and one of his principal arguments was taken from the article on the "Trade Union Movement in France," which I had the honor of contributing to the May number of this review. In this article I stated that the presence of a socialist minister in the cabinet had exerted a favorable influence on the trade unions. Jaures found a contradiction between this statement and de la Porte's motion stating that Millerand did no longer belong to the party. Hence he concluded that I had one opinion for use in America and another for use in Europe.

As the question has some importance, I request permission

to explain it here very shortly. How is it a contradiction to say on one side, that such and such a minister, who has marked sympathies for the working class, has at a given moment strengthened the organic evolution of the proletariat; and on the other to deny all solidarity between the same minister and the socialist party to which he may have belonged, but from which he separated?

Unhappily the working class and the socialist party do not coincide completely. The socialist party is indeed essentially a workingmen's party, but it encompasses only that part of the proletariat which has arrived to the full consciousness of its class interests and its revolutionary role. While the working class might, without a higher ideal to guide it, compromise with capitalist society and seek to improve its functions instead of transforming its bases, the socialist party, on the contrary, fights for the purpose of breaking down the bourgeois order and substituting a new regime for the old.

No doubt, in this fight it helps the laboring class to obtain as many political and juridical safeguards as possible, and it concentrates all its efforts on labor legislation. For this reason it is led to support all liberal ministers who are more or less in sympathy with the laboring classes in proportion as they serve the interests of the labor movement.

When, therefore, a minister like Millerand stimulates by certain phases of his work—not by all—the trade union movement, why should we deny the results of his actions in these special points? Why should we furthermore refuse to recognize that his capacity as a socialist, which is being attributed to him rightly or wrongly, has on one side provoked numerous strikes by creating futile hopes in the laborers, and on the other has also broken down a certain distrust of the laborers in the public powers and encouraged the proletariat to unite against the employers?

Nobody has ever denied this work of Millerand, just as no one denies the work of Waldeck Rousseau, the father of the law of 1884 on trade unions. All this is the general result of the activity of all democratic ministers who wish to give the working classes their share in a capitalist environment. The history of labor legislation proves this.

To recognize this truth—to affirm that the working class has profited in a certain measure by the presence of Millerand in the public power—does that prevent us from *placing ourselves on another standpoint, the socialist point of view*, and from saying that the action of Millerand has put our party out of place and arrested its organic development?

After appreciating the reform minister, cannot we pronounce

judgment on the party member, the deputy who belonged to the parliamentary socialist group? And after recognizing that the minister has occasionally played a useful role on the reform ground, is it not allowed to declare that Millerand, on the socialist ground, has violated the essential laws of party discipline and placed himself outside of the party?

This idea of the party must be introduced in order to judge Millerand. A party is an organism complete in itself, with special laws for its internal management, a special code of ethics, theoretical principles and tactical rules. Millerand transgressed this code of laws, principles and rules. No matter how good a democratic minister he may be, he cannot be a socialist worthy of the name.

This is what I wanted to say, as well in the International Socialist Review as by signing de la Porte's motion. This is what I have always said in *Le Mouvement Socialiste*, which I have edited since its foundation.

III.

What is the socialist situation in France after the Lyons congress?

If we glance at it superficially it seems that there are two clearly defined socialist camps in France: on one side, those who stayed at the Lyons congress; on the other, those who bolted and those who did not come at all.

Those who stayed were: The majority of the autonomous federations that are practically anti-ministerialist but wish to accomplish unity and are opposed to all schisms; the independent party, partisans of ministerialism, who rallied a little force for the support of Briand's motion; the last groups of the Allemanists who are in full dissolution; and the remainder of the Broussists who are almost extinct. Those who bolted were the Blanquists, the Alliance Communiste and the autonomous revolutionary federations allied to them. Those who did not come at all are the Guesdists.

Among those who stayed unity remains established, all the more so because a unity program was adopted which no doubt has only a transitory value, but still is no less real for all that. Among those who bolted or did not come at all, that is among the elements of the extreme left, a revolutionary alliance is on the verge of being created. The deputies belonging to these factions have already left the parliamentary socialist group and formed a so-called revolutionary group in distinction from the other.

On examining the situation more closely, however, it does not seem that this division of French socialism is anything else

but a quite accidental state of things that cannot last very long. Every one of these two groups, in fact, comprises such heterogeneous and contradictory elements that their association cannot have a definite meaning and a long duration. Among those who stayed at the congress and who will retain the name "Parti Socialiste Français," there is an extreme right, ministerialists, reformers and anti-revolutionaries; and beside these, there is the greater part of the autonomous federations that are frankly revolutionary. Among the groups of the extreme left, there existed old feuds that provoked such personal rivalries that their union can apparently never be very solid; they are also separated by profound doctrinary differences. And as for the autonomous federations that have followed these groups so far, they are absolutely independent from them.

It cannot be said, therefore, that an absolutely distinct revolutionary party is on one side and a reform party on the other side of French socialism. There are revolutionary and reform elements; but the ranks that enclose them are not clearly defined.

The truth is that new forms of organizations assume a more and more important part: the autonomous federations. They occupy in a manner a central position in French socialism, just as far removed from the uncompromising dogmatism of the old parties as from the opportunism of the simply reformatory ministerialists. They will develop and gradually withdraw the members and influence from the old organizations, thus founding slowly the bases of future unity. Geographically they form the natural mould into which all the energy and activity must flow. But evidently they are still far from playing this dominant role. They are not numerous enough, they are too young and above all they are too isolated from each other. They are nevertheless our future, and the facilitation of their evolution is the duty of all French socialists who await a better organization of their party.

This development can be assisted only by insisting on peace among the socialist parties. While internal feuds are raging, our activity and energy are diverted from practical work. Under a comparative peace in the party, on the contrary, the autonomous federations will be able to follow their logical course and to mature all their fruit.

In order to obtain this socialist peace, organic bonds of contact should be created between the two present groups that were formed after the Lyons congress. We must return a step and improve the "Committee on Agreement" of 1899, that was so supple and plastic and left to all the interested factions

their full independence. But is it possible to form this "Committee on Agreement?" We think so. The old parties have no logical reason to refuse it, and it is plainly desired by the autonomous federations. If we accomplish this, we shall have obtained the highest degree of unity that is feasible for the moment and prepared the way for future unity

Paris, June 8, 1901.

Hubert Lagardelle.

Editor of "The Mouvement Socialiste."

(Translated by E. Untermann.)



Paganism vs. Socialism

THEY are surely the world's true philosophers who seek to relate the contemporaneous things of the world. Whether the other philosophers want to see them related or not the facts of man's world must be related. Two of these facts are Christianity and Socialism, and the couple seem now to be approaching each other with amicable intent, and several friends of the parties seem to differ about the affair; some, like myself, favor the union, because it is inevitable and we hate runaway matches anyway; and others, like Julian, are disposed to forbid the bans, not liking one of the parties.

Julian complains of "the persistency with which the relations between Christianity and socialism are thrust forward" by persons he has in mind; persons, who, despairing of introducing socialism into Christianity, are now attempting to Christianize socialism. Let them go ahead, brother Julian. That they love socialism enough to have made the former attempt should make us love them: that they failed in that attempt should remove any occasion to fear them: that they have faith enough in socialism to abide here and to get along with us while our Julians would fain get along without them makes us long for more of them.

A few general characteristics of Julian's essay may be noted here, after which I will proceed to my own purpose of showing that Christianity and socialism belong to each other. I note in Julian's method the following: 1. A generous transition from one meaning to another in the use of words. 2. A phenomenally poetic mind engaged in building a strictly materialistic philosophy on the foundations of fancy in Greek history. 3. A singular deftness in angling out of the stream of history the rag needed and leaving all the rest there. 4. A notion that there are two sorts of human minds, one of which is materialist and the other not. 5. A simple child-like faith that he knows enough of the ancient world experience to find and sum up its lesson in a couple of pages of our International Socialist Review. 6. A bland and beautiful belief that he is the possessor of an unprejudiced scientific mind which enables him to see things just as they are. 7. A strange delusion concerning the identity of egoism and socialism. These are my impressions of the machine that produced the Julian essay. I now proceed to my own production, in the full conviction that the tinge of my mind and its resulting expressions of it are

just as much the product of my environment as Julian's thinking machine, or this piece of paper.

He says: "That the attempt to unite socialism and Christianity is a failure, both sides faring indifferently in the process."

I admit that Christianity as an institution fares indifferently by the process to which Comrade Herron has been subjecting it, viz., of contrasting it with its own ideal as an organized following of the steps and instructions of Jesus. On the other hand, the sober earthly doctrine of economic and political revolution needed to-day and called socialism, has not fared indifferently by that process; but it has fared very well and will so continue to fare while the process goes on—while Christians come our way bringing their moral enthusiasm with them, and recognizing the material elements for which we contend, and having the class consciousness with which at this stage of labor's subjugation we must struggle.

Mere revivals of religion have come and gone into the stomach of Mammon over and over again, because they began with the mind, were aimed at the mind and culminated there, and only incidentally and temporarily did they improve the conditions of the slave class; but a dual movement resting upon, and aiming primarily at that which hitherto has destroyed all other revivals, taking possession of economics as its own, alone secures the spiritual salvation of the race, which, I believe, always has meant the salvation of each man from the selfish to the social, that is, *from* Julian's paganism *to* socialism, and the salvation of society from its armed aristocracies.

He who perceives that continuity is the law of natural processes should be able to see the same law in mental and religious processes, and therefore to approach religion, so large a part of humanity, without fear or hatred. We cannot appear very sincere in our trust or love of humanity if we separate ourselves from its principal experiences with loathing—and though a pagan may claim to be a mere sublunary worldling as compared with all the others who lift their thoughts above earth and say prayers, yet as a matter of fact it is the dissenter from the common way who in this case is living the superlunary life. The majority of people under the moon have formed a habit of believing in religious practices and the philosopher who would work with that majority should learn, in the mental and moral propaganda, the lesson of the continuity of nature's processes. I mean the lesson of not running away from that which is.

He seeks to accomplish too much and will therefore accomplish nothing who requires, in the name of socialism, that all men who are not materialists shall change their creeds, and abandon the social habits of their religions, and shall pull out by the roots the sentiments and traditions of centuries of child-

hood. And he will do nothing who superciliously separates himself as a new-fangled pagan from the common life, which it is his duty to abide by and help into the cleansing thoughts of socialism, the equality of all men, and our equal right to the business and pleasures of life all together. Whether religion has been planted among us by accident or something more; and, whether to the critic it seem to be good or bad, wise or foolish; its prayers efficacious or ridiculous; its precepts philosophical or otherwise; the truth still remains that religion is one of the most extensive facts of the human race's experience; and those comrades who plume themselves on their special devotion to the fact and science are not well establishing the validity of their claim by ignoring, or antagonizing, the fact that religion is a prevailing habit of the people; that its poems, prayers and traditions supply expressions, the only expressions for their emotions and affections; those that are plus the sexual, and which make man a creature now longing for socialism. It would be a far better evidence of their scientific tact and temper to drop quarreling with that which seems to be almost a part of the constitution of man, and if they love socialism to learn to love it wisely on behalf of the people; that is, by hating religion less. Of course the pagan egoist who sneers at the one universal message of religion—self-subjection; who believes in the intrinsic and eternal sanctions and rightness of the single life, and the certainty with which, if let alone, it will work out the problem of the collective, will not try to hate religion any the less for the sake of the commonweal, but will throw the rein freely on the necks of this and all other aversions, and will be himself; suffering the soul of society, Mazeppa like, to be riven asunder, in concession to a blind faith in the validity of the personal life for public matters. This is the pagan attitude of mind favored by the essay under review; it is also the anarch attitude; and it is, in my opinion, wholly incompatible with the successful propagation of socialism in America, or any other country, not excluding pagan Greece, where an antagonism to the mental habit of the people would have been as barren in the fertility of a new propaganda as elsewhere. The true attitude of a scientific socialist, that is a socialist who knows how to succeed, is to accept that marrow fact around which all religions cluster,—the necessity of subordinating the single life to the greater life—doing it consciously and willingly; thus the main truth of socialism,—the collective life, becomes the complement of the religious main truth,—self-denial, which this writer scornfully thinks of as a cowering mystical orientalism.

The propriety of assailing religion should never be questioned, for few things on earth require it more; so weighted is it with falsehoods, and so charged with treason to its trust—the life of the people: yet to assail it for anything smaller than

itself is a treason greater than its own; to assail it on behalf of a personal paganism, an archaic anarchy, is a pigmy's enterprise; but to correct and rebuke it in the interests of socialism is simply to check the child in the interests of its own future manhood; for socialism is to be, shall be the future manhood of all religions.

However we may blush to see the churches adapting and incorporating into themselves the hideous crime of capitalist slavemaking and indorsing the loathsome philosophy of competing with and overcoming human life for gold, it is still a human gain, I think, that the habit of the Christian church compels ministers to speak every week words of justice, love and surrender, by which they are self-condemned at least, and which, in spite of their odious practices, keeps the ideal of a larger life, personified in God, alive. However they stagger, the lamp still burns.

The new and true attitude of socialism towards all religions will result in spiritualizing socialism and placing, in our case, Christianity on the six-day materialistic basis of the world's daily work, daily deeds and daily needs. This attitude will indeed Christianize American socialism by socializing American Christianity, and the result will be not an indifferent faring for both, as the Julian article states, but a very decided welfaring.

We have committed some blunders heretofore in our rigid economic deliverance of the socialist hope,—we have been loyally demanding the impossible from those about us when requiring them to understand along with our new politics an entirely new academic philosophy of life, and our unreasonableness has cost us half a century of success. But now a stranger thing still is demanded of us; we are asked to become pagans as a necessary preliminary step to socialism. What about circumcision!

The distinction attempted by Julian between paganism and Christianity is this; that the people, or the aristocracy of Greece, whichever he chooses, were materialists only and did not believe in the supernatural, but he is wrong. What the people believed in the poets indicate, and whether it be in Hesiod or Homer we look, there is enough of the supernatural to match all the miracles and fancies of Christianity, with quite a museum of odds left to the credit of Greece. They had their altars, lustrations, priests, priestesses, holocausts, prayers and other such things; none of which can be accounted for on the purely materialistic and anti-supernatural theory. To be sure the writer affects the society of those intellectual aristocrats, the stoics of later times, but they were not Greece—they were not paganism. If on the other hand, he desires to limit the word paganism to that school, why travel into an-

tiquity for his paganism, since we have it better expressed in our own materialistic writers.

We should learn to pity believers whose faiths we cannot adopt, if their faiths came into their lives without any action of their own; and we should learn to pity because some of us stand in need of such commiseration ourselves, even for opinions we have voluntarily adopted. It does look as if most mortals were doomed to a certain amount of gullibility; not including poor Julian in this his passing fancy for the Greeks as the people who have the real religion for socialism, because they had none. The whole thing is so super-materialistically, naively, and credulously pretty, that if you will permit an Irish critic to have his native he cow, I think that it was not the author who wrote it at all, but his sister Juliana. The modern highly developed intellectual egoist has, since the revival of ancient literature in the middle ages, sighed for Greece. That little peninsula of poets, pirates and philosophers finds a devotee in every student who, by culture, sweetness and light, desires to find a place among the best minds. This Greek worship early stamped itself on the individualist revolt known as the protestant reformation, and the most pronounced egoists among the modern poets were ever since Hellenists. From Hellas there came down ready-made God-descended aristocrats. In London or New York we have no such genealogical mountain turning us out polished off personalities, but we have an individualistic self-culturing, competing process of regularly evolved aristocrats under Spencer and the banks.

The pagan mind held up to our admiration here is described as the objective, seeking all knowledge boldly because unconscious of its limitations; while Christianity is "the cowering attitude of the oriental mind, paralyzed before the unknowable," and therefore not seeking knowledge; and yet, strange to say, getting all the knowledge Julian has and giving it to him. One of the many things in this paper which I do not understand is why a people unconscious of their limitations, as the Greeks are described to be, should so ardently seek knowledge; and why the other people, described as conscious of their limitations, should therefore never seek to overstep them. It is to the mind conscious of its limitations we owe our all. The oriental mind, the mind that came out of many ages of tribulation, and which had learned its limitations among millions of its fellow creatures; the individual, crushed into passivity under the despotic power of a barbarous collectivism sitting on the thrones of ancient empires; this mind to which society had long taken the place of nature, brought its message of law and stamped it on the Roman world. Rome, far reaching, autonomous, regal, imperial Rome brought the East to the West thus, and Greece, because of its inherent anarchy, shriveled under the touch, its

paganism perished; and though capitalism has galvanized it into artificial life for a night, it will perish in the morning of economic solidarity.

True philosophy reconciles the subjective with the objective mind in a social compact. The subjective mind in action yields the religious life, the life of unreliance upon ego, the life of allegiance to the greatest, the one that seeks its endorsement, its support, its consolation from the higher reservoirs of social consent. It is this, and not the pagan type of self-culture and the assertion of self-sufficiency, that is fittest to survive into socialism; yet not necessarily at the unequal cost of the other. Egoism needs no philosophy for its defensiveness—it is provided in the very fact of its separate physical organism with a complete armory of defense. The whole power of philosophy and intellect must ever be called in on behalf of the true defendant, society, which the pagan anarchist is born to attack.

But strictly speaking the paganism of self-culture never stood alone anywhere; neither did the Christianity of self-surrender; Greece could only be kept alive by this oriental principle. The impersonalism imposed upon slaves or voluntarily yielded by many wise people—the principle of self-abeyance, of personal subordination—has always been the salt of society—the best thing in the world, and therefore the pearl of great price, the one thing that all religions enshrine. I do not believe in Julian's method of analyzing history with a butcher's cleaver. I do not recognize that the East was ever so separated from the West as he imagines. I believe the same mental forces were always everywhere present in the whole human social experience, and I recognize in Julian a good religious dissenter, who, like the late Mr. Ingersoll, simply takes his rosary out to a little cave of his own, while the other fellows stay on the church pavement.

In the last analysis the mental life of the world has been the swing of the pendulum from the man self-esteeming and the man self-surrendered; and the latter is the man of socialism.

We are all more or less in this conflict, but the man who is conscious of his limitations is more likely to get good, and to bring good out of the experience, than he who acts as if cosmos had been always in labor to bring forth himself. Comrade Julian has struck socialism simply because he is not a pagan, and he sticks to it for the same reason. When he acts as he reasons there will be one more anarchist. First, and this did not make him a pagan, he disliked Christianity. Second, he adopts socialism. Now, inasmuch as he has adopted socialism, it must, he thinks, be something very different from Christianity, say paganism. Whereupon it seems natural to him that they should be antagonistic to each other. It only remained for him to identify his paganism with everybody else's social-

ism to prove to him that socialism and Christianity are opposed to each other.

Paganism was merely an unabashed childlike study of the laws of nature, thinks Julian, while the religion of Christianity—the oriental ideal—stood for the complete annihilation of self, and it was only what he calls the social instinct of self-preservation that saved the world from Christianity. This sounds odd, but the full-grown self-centered egoist has a self that soon centers the universe, and therefore must needs think that self-preservation is the only social instinct, whereas, had it not been for the social sense—the gift of God—self-preservation would have put an end to humanity long ago.

"It was due to paganism," he adds, "that the doctrines of the humble and meek carpenter of Nazareth became militant and aggressive." This is correct. The paganism of the individual life soon conquered social Christianity, and it is the reconquest from the pagan church goes that now engages the persons who are mis-called Christian socialists, to distinguish them from materialist socialists. As well seek to separate Christian art from the paint, canvas, marble and chisels employed in it! Neither the word materialist nor the word Christian is big enough to cover the science of complete human living. The word Christian is not big enough for that which has preserved the race through its terrible economic experiences ready for the merciful revolution of socialism, and the word material, or its new equivalent, "pagan," substituted by Julian, is not big enough to cover the splendid activities either of the present class struggle or the noble legislation of future days.

In conclusion let me remind Julian and others that scientific people have their cant and other little weaknesses, not always obvious to the eye of self-delusion, just like other mortals; that the modern unprejudiced student of mankind with that glassy eye and all enveloped in the cold white sheet of reason, penetrating into such awful places as holies of holiests, neither railing, scoffing nor deriding, but just only studying, inquiring and tracing facts to their origin and examining things as they are without fear or prejudice, *armed with the weapon of science*, is a fiction, a mere self picture of the student's own fancy only; as truly spooky to fact as if Hamlet's father were to stalk across this page. The original does not exist, neither outside nor inside of Julian. To admit the existence of such a philosophy is unphilosophical, "it deals with beliefs which forbid and exclude rational discussion," which is one of our critic's opening remarks concerning Christianity; a good remark, by the way, with which to decline the discussion of Christianity altogether, but not a very good one with which to commence such a discussion—in a philosophic way. But philosophers are odd creatures.

I will not apologize—no, not with half a tear, as Julian does—for the Grecian philosophy that could not rise above the recognition of slavery as a proper condition for some men in former times; neither can I condemn Christianity because “its precepts were for a society of masters and slaves, of rich and poor,” since, as a socialist I do not accept the supernatural in morals; but I do protest against the unfairness of saying that Christianity contemplated the perpetuity of slavery while paganism did not. (The perpetuity of contemplations may not weigh much anyway.) But neither the wisdom of Zeno nor the charity of Jesus could enable the ancient or mediaeval worlds to maintain cities and states without slaves. Not until the birth of the race’s material redeemer was emancipation from slavery a possibility—not until that cross was raised, the modern machine on which the proletariat is now crucified, was the fact of the race’s solidarity developed and our ensuing liberation from private property made imminent. Therefore, this is the first time in our history that we have been called upon to choose the philosophy of a race. Personal paganism, the ego culture of the best minds of Greece, is not that philosophy. The modern scented, soulless epicureanism of a sneer is not that philosophy. The system which thinks that human hearts and brains must be laid on ice in order to know the truth is not that philosophy—it is not the paganism of the unit life but the spiritualism of an impersonal life that shall survive into the aeon of socialism.

Peter E. Burrowes.



The Detroit Conference

THE fact which was made most prominent by the Second National Social and Political Conference was that the logic and principles of socialism are absolutely invincible. Some said that the socialists captured the conference. But it was not socialists but socialism that carried all before it. Over and over again the principles of clear-cut international socialism were sent forth from the platform with a challenge to deny them. But not a single person of all the multitude of "reformers" dared to take the platform in opposition to those principles. Some complained of the arrogance and conceit of socialists, but none essayed the task of exploding the socialist principles.

It cannot be denied that from the "reformers' " point of view the socialists were arrogant. They organized two meetings for the especial purpose of demonstrating their superiority to the general mass of confusion that made up much of the conference. They never lost an opportunity to tell the defenders of the various "schemes" and "isms," that their plans were but mere phantasies of the brain, while socialism was the one great and imminent fact in modern social development. As there was no disputing these facts those attacked responded by saying that the socialists were intolerant and narrow,—a logic that is difficult to answer even if not convincing.

Just a word on the make-up of the conference. There were about twenty-five single-taxers who clung to their sixteenth century doctrines with a tenacity worthy of a better cause. A dozen or so professional party politicians were looking for timber to repair badly dilapidated party fences, but finding nothing suitable and being annoyed by those miserable socialists, who insisted on telling them some wholesome truths to their faces, they nearly all left the city before the last days of the conference. Another dozen was made up of what might properly be called "cranks,"—poor monomaniacs, with some scheme for social regeneration, whose overwhelming importance in their eyes had made them lose all sense of proportion.

The remainder, and the great majority of the delegates, of whom the public has heard almost nothing, were enthusiastic intelligent men and women who were eagerly seeking to learn as much as possible concerning social relations and laws. It was this class that socialism captured, and it was a worthy conquest.

The one greatest obstacle that could arise to the advance of socialism in this country would be the formation of a

pseudo-socialist party. Yet I am not of those who attach very much importance to the appearance of such a party because I believe that industrial development has reached such a stage in America that there are not enough elements with conflicting economic interests and intellectual confusion remaining to support such a party for any great length of time. In my opinion nothing on earth can prevent for more than a very few years the final line-up between socialism and capitalism. At the same time I do not believe in whistling to keep my courage up when a real obstacle appears. Neither do I believe in an ostrich-like hiding of the head in the sands of prejudice and party conceit and declaring that no danger exists. The fact is that there is nothing now that is within the realm of probabilities that would be as great an obstacle to social progress as the formation of a Fabian, anti-class-struggle, public ownership, non-partisan, initiative-and-referendum-first, confused and nondescript, "socialist" party. That there was great hopes of forming such a party at Detroit there is no doubt. Lee Meriwether and his followers were there with a half dozen democratic politicians who had been kicked out of the regular democratic machine. The organ of the "Public Ownership" party of Missouri was distributed to all the delegates. It was noticeable that the trump card of the representatives of this party was the statement that the socialists were with them. This was an eloquent testimonial to the respect in which the small but powerful socialist movement is held by the politicians. When this lie was crammed down their throat and the conference was informed that the socialists had had no connection whatever with their party, save one of uncompromising hostility, this particular crowd of politicians left the conference in a body.

Congressman J. J. Lentz showed the hand of this body of confusionists when he poured out a fulsome eulogy on the work of the German socialists, ending with a nauseating climax of political trickery by touting Bismark as the "greatest of German socialists." It was but the work of a minute for one of the socialist delegates to expose this falsehood and drive him from the conference. The opportunity was taken at this time for the socialists to show that this speech was but an indication of the intention on the part of the "New Democracy" to "Bismark" America. The Iron Chancellor never made any secret of his hostility to socialism and never denied that his famous "socialistic" measures were efforts to stem the rising tide of socialism. But his American imitators are less honest if more skillful. They seek to secure the support of the socialists in the effort to fight socialism and boldly declare themselves to be socialists in order that they may get close enough to the revolutionary movement to stab it in the back.

The appearance of this movement in America is simply an indication that socialism has become a power with which the politicians must reckon. It is also an indication that the time has come when socialists must prepare to reckon with politicians when counting up the enemies of their cause.

Owing to the activity of the socialists at the conference, to their continuous exposure of the tricks of the politicians and the errors of the reformers, all attempts to form a "Bismarkian socialist" party were abandoned. On the contrary the group which was called to form such a party unanimously agreed to recommend to the conference the endorsement of the Social Democratic Party and the sending of delegates to the Indianapolis convention.

On the closing day of the conference came an incident that testified once more to the invincibility of the socialist principles. The socialist group had prepared a series of resolutions embracing the full position of class-conscious revolutionary socialism with independent political action. But these resolutions were arranged in the form of a series of logical arguments from fundamental and indisputable premises. The result was that by an overwhelming vote each one of the series was accepted individually. This demonstrated that no person of intelligence could dispute or even dared to vote against the principles of socialism. But as soon as the timid members of the conference discovered that what they had endorsed was socialism they became suddenly frightened and voted to lay on the table as a whole the thing they had just adopted seriatim. It was perhaps the most ludicrous admission by a body of men and women that they did not have the courage to stand by their convictions, that history has ever afforded. When the humorous side of the social revolution is written the historian will find a rich mine in the proceedings of the Second National Social and Political Conference.

Taking the conference as a whole every act and result justified the part taken by socialists in its deliberations and showed that those who opposed the participation of socialists spoke from their ignorance, while those who went acted on the knowledge they possessed. It should be a lesson to those who are ever ready to criticise the actions of others.

It is practically certain that there will never be another conference. No power on earth would drag the politicians and confusionists into range of the socialists again. But there is just one suggestion arises out of this fact that may be of value to the socialists. Would it not be a most desirable thing if a socialist conference could be called for each year where the points of differences between socialists could be discussed. Practically every body of professional men and women with common interests make a practice of holding such gatherings

and find them very profitable. There is certainly no body more in need of them than the socialists. Points of differences could be there discussed and disagreements fought out. The conference would have no power to act save by virtue of what influence it might have because of its intellectual ability. Consequently there would be no material benefits over which to struggle and its deliberations could be marked by an intellectual impartiality impossible in an official national convention. Such a gathering would be of the greatest propaganda value and would attract thousands who could not be reached by other methods. The suggestion is at least worth the consideration of the Indianapolis convention and of the party at large.

A. M. Simons.



False Critics vs. False Prophets

MANY years of practical participation in socialist propaganda and agitation should have taught any careful student that the prophets, extravagant prognosticators, sentimentalists and sanguinary participants are necessary to a world-wide movement. They furnish the spirit and animation while the doctrinaire supplies the vertebrae or backbone of the movement. The sanguinary temperament certainly deserves to be lauded and cherished if borne by reason and conviction. Cholerick attacks upon a movement or its supporters, which lack sufficient material to base the contention upon, shake the self-confidence of the young and their faith in mankind. Though the earnest and honest student will emphatically protest against restriction of research, he will detest fallacies and wrong conclusions contained in criticisms that can have but one purpose;—to irritate and confuse those who are in search for truth. If criticisms shall be beneficent to the critic and student, they must be made for the sake of the truth that shall be revealed. The use of accurate terms is an indispensable necessity if a clear comprehension of the point in view shall be obtained. As it is necessary in physics to distinguish between attraction, repulsion and gravitation, so it is necessary in political economy to discriminate between value, use-value, exchange value, price and surplus value. Though by the abstraction from the one, the other may be obtained, they are nevertheless distinct phenomena; for instance, a price may be put upon the head of an officer who has committed treason to his country. His head may have no value, though nature was its mother and labor its father. It assumes the form of a use-value as soon as, beside the owner of it, another individual desires to possess it. Its exchange value it derives from the willingness of two parties to exchange, for instance, the head of the officer for a cabbage. In this particular instance the cabbage would be a price upon the head, whilst "an object may have a price without having value."

In the June number of the *International Socialist Review* appears an article by Herman Whitaker, "Some Misconceptions of Marx," in which the writer pretends to reveal "erratic thought, erroneous statistics and exaggerations current in socialistic circles." On page 776 he says: "He (Marx) says himself that labor gives exchange value (i. e., makes them exchangeable) to all commodities."

Marx never committed himself like this. Vol. 2. "Capital."
"What makes them exchangeable is the mutual desire of their

owners to alienate them." If labor were to "give" exchange-value, then everything created by labor must be exchangeable. Labor "gives" neither exchange-value nor use-value but it creates both, that is, with the aid of nature.. A use-value that has also exchange-value must be of use to others beside its owner. A product may have value because labor is invested in it. It may have use-value because its owner can make use of it; but it has not the quality of "exchange" unless it is of use to some one else beside its owner. Use-value exists only because labor-power has been invested, aided, of course, by nature, and it can be measured only by that which created the value, that is, labor-power, the quantity measured by time.

Furthermore our critic says on the same page, "Of course the wine of '72 was superior in quality to the wine of '71, but nevertheless the difference in quality renders it unclassifiable by the labor-theory." If the labor-theory means anything, it is "that the value of a commodity is determined by the quantity of labor spent on it." "Capital," Vol. I. It is not the wine or the product that is rendered unclassifiable on account of its quality; it can only be the quantity of labor-time spent upon it that renders it unclassifiable, in so far as the period of the aggregate output of wine was too short to measure it by the "labor-time socially necessary that is required to produce an article under normal conditions of production, and with the average degree of skill and intensity prevalent at the time," "Capital," Vol. I. Two objects must be qualitatively different that they may stand in relation as commodities. The critic says: "It is almost pathetic to watch the efforts of a well-meaning and earnest socialist when he attempts to prove that the price of every article exchanged on a modern market is determined by the quantity of labor which produced it." Without even an attempt at setting this pathetic effort aright by saying that it never was and never will be the price of an article exchanged that is determined by the quantity of labor, he proceeds to add to the confusion by proceeding as follows: "Under existing conditions this law (the Marxian law of exchange?) can apply only to averages and every attempt to make it cover all individual cases is bound to result in failure." Speaking of *price*, the author can mean nothing else by "apply only to averages" than the *price*.

Where did Marx confound price with exchange value? Our "well-meaning and earnest socialist" should primarily be set aright in that the quantity of labor does not determine the *price*, as prices cease altogether to express value, although money is the value-form of commodities. To criticise a student of Marx it requires a clear and distinct use of the terms used by Marx and political economists in general. Marx should not be quoted as understood, but literally. The author's

second endeavor to make dwindle the surplus-value and surplus product, is founded upon wrong and imperfect statistics and wrong conclusions from such statistics. When using imperfect statistics one may avoid drawing wrong conclusions by using them only to show a general tendency. The statistics made use of in this paper are taken from editorials by Carroll D. Wright in the *Bulletin of Labor*, Washington, D. C. According to the census of 1880, the average price of the product of each laborer was \$1,888; the 1890 census gives the average price as \$2,204, or an increase of \$316. The average wage of the laborer who produced the product is given for 1880, \$347; for 1890, \$445, an increase of \$98. While the price of the product of the laborer rose \$316 his wage went up only \$98. This is a relative decrease of wages, or in other words, a larger share of surplus-value went into the pocket of the capitalist. Failing to see how the difference of \$218 can be conjured from the pockets of the capitalist into the pockets of the laborer, the actual producer, we await further enlightenment. The percentage of 1890 census is divided as follows: 20.18 per cent to labor, 24.74 per cent to profit and 55.08 per cent to "material." This so-called raw material constitutes the bulk of the laborers' product, that is, \$1,294 out of \$2,204.

"Every element," says Marx, "is either the spontaneous produce of nature, or invariably owes its existence to a special productive activity, exercised with a definite aim—an activity that appropriates particular nature-given materials to particular human wants." Thus the \$1,294, or 55.08 per cent of the laborers' product which is supposed to constitute material, must, according to Marx, be the spontaneous produce of nature or must owe its existence to a special productive activity. Is it to be supposed that this enormous bulk could pass for a "product of ability?" Or is it a sort of "Manna," a kind of heavenly gift to the capitalist? Until a more scientific explanation is given than furnished by the United States labor statistician, as to its wherefrom, whereabouts and whereto, we shall classify it to its larger degree among the price-lists of the capitalist. It is nevertheless safe, in want of better evidence, to rely upon Marx's scientific view-point. He says, "*Capital*," Vol. I, part I, chapter 3, section 1: "An imaginary price-form may sometimes conceal either a direct or indirect value relation; for instance, the price of uncultivated land, which is without value, because no human labor has been incorporated in it." The smaller per cent of this bulk of "material" we shall classify as "useful labor expended upon the product; taking away the material substratum which is furnished by nature without the help of man." This material substratum is the "Manna." The fact that the wage of the laborer and the profit of the capitalist can not buy the part called material as they

stand together at \$990 wages and profit, as against \$1,294 material, should set any serious student of political economy thinking as to the imperfection of our statistics. Out of every 100 points the laborer scores but 20.18 per cent, and the rest counts almost entirely against him as surplus value, surplus product, or some other kind of fleecing. No matter how the remaining 79.82 per cent may be disposed of, "either in champagne and other luxuries or in more wage slaves and more machinery," they certainly are in the possession of some one else than the producer of the product. It is reserved for the laborer to learn and know that capitalist economics do not permit him to go beyond the limit of 20.18 per cent, and it is for him to decide when and at what period there shall be called a halt to the downward tendency. Anything in value, or better at the capitalists' price, equal to 20.18 per cent, the laborer may buy out of the market and all that he may decide in the bargain is, what degree of abstinence may I reach?

No, a thousand times no, the trouble does not lie with the "misconceiving" student of Marx nor with the prophet socialist nor with any of the epigony of Marx. The trouble lies with those who trust too much to capitalist vulgar economists. It is this trust that causes workingmen to see a constant diminution of surplus value and surplus product and causes them to fall back into their arm-chairs with complacence and "begin to materially alter their views of things." This gradually develops into a fancy, like calling England a "political democracy" and a dream of the benevolent, though unconscious historical capitalist activity of converting capitalist institutions into quasi-public institutions, or "Industrial Democracy" established without the conscious mind of the working class or capitalist class being aware of such development. The Marxian conception of science is to them unscientific; Marx himself "behind the age" when he says, "One capitalist always kills many," because those capitalists that fear to be killed in the mad struggle for supremacy shall unconsciously work toward the establishment of state socialism. To save themselves they will become the unconscious promoters of the socialization of the centralized means of production, and all the discipline, unity and organization of the working class caused by the very "mechanism of the capitalist process of production itself" will count for naught, and the revolt of the working class, which naturally should grow "with oppression, misery, degradation and exploitation caused by the usurpation and monopolization of all the advantages of the capitalist process of transformation," will be "benevolently" and "providently" avoided by the "constantly diminishing number of magnates." Glorious revolution! Upon thy pedestal shall stand, to your eternal glorification, the personification of Private Capital.

The vulgarity of economics manifests itself in the making-up of statistics. Great items are mentioned under one heading and neither the capitalist statistician nor the student apply them properly by making abstractions from them. The one avoids an analysis in the interests of capital and the other is under the influence of capitalist economics. Thus: Raw material (the material substratum) does not drop into the lap of the capitalist. Superintendence is an addition to the value of the product and therefore wage. Rent is everlasting fleecing. Insurance ditto. Taxes are the debts incurred by all citizens alike and paid by the capitalist from the surplus value and surplus product extracted by the capitalist fleecing process from the laboring class. Additional direct taxes which are not mentioned by the statistician are paid by the laborer from the share (20.18 per cent) allotted him. "Freight" is an addition to the value of the product and is constituted partly of wage and partly of fleecing. "New equipment" is surplus value transformed into surplus product called constant capital. "Other expenses" is too general a term to be dealt with in a scientific manner. "Repairs" is another term for new equipment, or extension of plant, and the like. All these and more the labor power of the laborer has produced, in the production of which he is "constantly helped by nature." The laborer does not own them, has no voice in their management and is therefore justified in demanding the surrender of capitalist private property on the ground that it is immoral and dangerous to permit a few to usurp the powers of economic administration. It is in the interests of the capitalist that a capitalist statistician shall not go into a scientific analysis of statistics, as Karl Marx did, because a revelation made known by the powers that be would certainly have a detrimental and immediate effect upon the stability of the present system. The workingmen who under such a system are prone to submit to the execution of the "bond," would suddenly refuse to live up to the "bond" in the hands of the capitalist Shylock. This would probably include a more speedy manner of bringing our theories in harmony with observed facts, and a still more rapid development of a nobler and more equitable system.

As to the "looking for votes among the great mass of the people" let us be candid. Is not this the greatest error of the politician in the socialist? Yes, he looks for votes. He does not look for men who have the courage of their convictions, or at least have the consciousness that they are individuals of a class that is constantly wronged, and shall be wronged until the mass of the people awakens to the fact that a time-limit must be set and that no one will ever do it for them if they do not do it themselves. They do not look for men that realize the inability of the system to set its own time-limit, though

all private capital may have been centralized. They do not look for men that should know it to be an eternal truth that a slave with the ability to write and read is not worthy of his freedom unless he free himself, and make common cause with his fellow slaves.

August Bebel, who more than thirty years ago fixed the time limit at twenty years, still battles with the courage and conviction of a true, militant and class-conscious socialist, who cares naught for the votes of the masses but very much for the intellectual status of his fellow wage-workers. Wilhelm Liebknecht would have preferred to be sent to prison instead of being elected to the "Reichstag," if it had not been for the opportunity a seat in the "Reichstag" offered to speak to his fellow men of the different processes of capitalist fleecing, excessive waste of surplus value and surplus product,—"the motor power which is to drive society to socialism."

"The Roman slave was held by fetters; the wage laborer is bound by invisible threads," says Marx. Therefore it is our bounden duty, the duty of the more advanced and clear-sighted among the wage-workers, to make those invisible threads visible to the intellectual eyes of the workers; and if the limited education of the fellow wage-worker does not permit of the scientific language of Marx, then shout into his ear: More fruit is permitted to spoil upon the farms than is sold in the markets; because it does not pay the farmer to barrel it! If this does not bring him to his senses, shout into his ear: Sixty-five thousand dollar campaign and Burgundy banquets, while your children are in need of the necessities of life! Those "observed facts" and many more are easily procured and can be brought into "harmony with our theories."

Carl Pankopf.



The Charity Girl

By Caroline H. Pemberton, Author of "Stephen the Black," "Your Little Brother James," Etc.

CHAPTER X.

FIVE months passed by. A great international tragedy had taken place. The battleship "Maine" was blown up in the harbor of Havana. There was an immediate prospect of war; the nation, while breathing hard, was struggling for calmness; but every one knew this was merely preparatory to striking a blow.

Julian resolved that if war should come he would offer himself as a volunteer. In all ages, men had found on battlefields the one solace that exists for broken hearts—the kind of solace that a red-hot iron administers to the bite of a mad dog. His work for humanity had lost its power to bind his thoughts; he craved an overpowering distraction; and lastly, he declared to himself that he had always sympathized with the Cubans in their struggle for liberty.

During those long months Julian had been summoning his spirit before a tribunal which sat in perpetual session; with perverse ingenuity he had been pleading a defense of Marian which carried with it an indictment of himself. The incidents of his acquaintance with her now assumed the proportions of a tragedy, in which she appeared to him as driven, persecuted—overwhelmed by an unhappy destiny.

He recalled her appeal to him on the evening when he last saw her. He remembered the strange dejection of her replies which grew fainter as he insisted with the rapture of the idealist that he could find happiness in any world that held both himself and her. The world which had seemed so small to him no doubt appeared as illimitable space to her. His mood took on a bitter self-reproach. Marian at that moment was appealing to him to save her, and he had cast her from him when she stood alone on the edge of a precipice, looking down. Might she not have thrown herself as willingly on a sacrificial altar if he had so commanded? But he had given her no word of guidance—no help of any kind.

There was a chance for his mood to turn into derision of her pitiable weakness; but Julian shut the door of his mind on this view of the question. Pity of the most tender and exalted kind sat in the judgment seat of his soul when the image of Marian rose before it.

In some way he believed he might have saved her; he knew not how, but his confidence in his own integrity was strong and conclusive. He might have protected her, had he tried, from

the "influence" that was pursuing her with such malignancy. The being to whom she had decided to link her future had now lost personality and become a mere personification of evil, and as Julian contemplated the ugly abstraction his jealous anger died to the ground.

He knew now that his words during their last interview had been uttered in the secret faith that their lives were really intertwined and could not be separated. He had meant her to understand that the spiritual bond between them, invisible to all the world outside, was destined to hold them together, mysteriously, irrevocably! Marian was expected to read between the lines of his elevated discourse the sweet, vague hope which inspired his own soul and gave it courage to face the future, but she had not so read. The poor child had accepted her fate literally as he had spoken it; she had succumbed to the unutterable horror and loneliness of her position. Thus had she fallen a victim to the terrible power which had not scrupled to drag her into the depths of misery and dishonor.

So argued Julian from one long day to the next; he completed his moral surrender by lapsing into a condition of hopeless, irrepressible longing to behold once more the object of his thoughts. Would she have fled with *him*? was his secret question. At intervals he tried conscientiously—desperately—to bury himself again in his work.

The "Association" was now exhibiting a praiseworthy activity in opening its lecture hall for a series of profound discussions on Human Brotherhood. The chairman of each committee in charge of each department was to deliver an address on the subject from her special point of view, and afterwards there were to be discussions in which a fashionable, feminine and generally youthful audience was expected to take part.

Julian had been present at these meetings only when required to address them himself. He was frequently out of the city, and his work left him little time for theoretical sociology. During the week of a heavy blizzard, however, he found himself unable to carry out his plans in any direction, and his restless spirit drove him one day into the lecture room while an animated debate was in progress.

The audience was small in number but great in enthusiasm. The fair, fur-wrapped students who had braved the storm-swept streets sat gazing at the matronly chairman with rapture in their eyes; they laid brilliantly flushed cheeks against their costly fur collars and made of themselves pretty pictures of soulful womanhood. When called upon to express their opinions on the views of former speakers, their speech and bearing were at once elevated, earnest and parliamentary. Dogmatic assertion was a bugbear each was determined to

avoid. Their attitude of devotion—not bigotry—to a lofty, disinterested ideal had almost the effect of a religious inspiration. It was heightened possibly by a soft light falling on their faces through stained-glass windows; it was indeed both aesthetic and convincing.

Julian, sitting in a corner near the presiding officer's desk, looked and listened in dull wonder. The sympathetic voices, the refined pronunciation, the delicate phraseology, and the soft appeals of "*Does any one agree with me?*" or "*I should like to know the feeling of the meeting on this point,*" fell pleasantly and persuasively on his ear. It made a pleasing contrast to a meeting he had attended the night before of Single Tax enthusiasts, where everybody disagreed with everybody else, "on principle"—where each man could see nothing but his own principles violated in every verbal change suggested for a petition that was being drawn up for the reformation of society. Such radicals were far too much in earnest to be entertaining.

Julian was more than ever impressed by the extraordinary aptitude of the female mind for organization. Had he ever before thoroughly appreciated the abilities of his lady managers in this direction? He resolved now to listen more attentively. What was the point under discussion? He had not quite discovered it, but evidently it bore some relation to the noble theme of universal brotherhood—a phrase that was forever floating on the air within the walls of the "Association," for as his managers repeatedly said, it was the underlying basis of their work.

Accordingly, when the next speaker rose from the audience to turn toward the Chair a young, chiseled face beneath a dark purple hat covered with waving plumes, she commanded Julian's undivided attention.

"A point I should like to emphasize is one that has not been touched upon yet. No doubt it is on the program, but will the Chair give me permission to mention it now?"

The chairman nodded graciously.

"It is one that troubles me a great deal in visiting the poor; I think I really need to hear the subject discussed thoroughly. Please tell me if any other student in sociology feels as I do. When in the homes of the miserably poor, a morbid dread that I am doing these poor creatures more harm than good constantly overpowers me with a feeling almost of guilt."

"I think we need always to have that doubt in our minds, do we not?" suggested the chairman, with gentle, reproachful emphasis.

"Speaking generally, of course, I quite agree with you. But the thought borne in upon me is that we should avoid exciting envy in the minds of our unfortunate sisters when we go among them. I ask myself, do they look at my dress and vainly long

to imitate it? When we tell them that we come as sisters, believing in the universal brotherhood—that we are all sons and daughters of God—ought we not to take every precaution to prevent the rise of wicked thoughts in their hearts? Dear friends, you have no idea how much better I feel when I leave my carriage at home and wear my plainest gown! The thought I wish to suggest for your consideration—and I hope I may hear from all of you on the subject—is this: Ought we not to adopt a particular style of gown for our visiting—something severely simple and perhaps—ah—tailor-made—that would pass on the street for any other tailor-made costume, but would impress the idea of simplicity and economy on the minds of the improvident poor?”

Another fair student rose gently to her feet.

“This seems to me a *very* important suggestion. We certainly wish to do good and not harm, and no detail is too trifling for us to consider. But may I ask, merely for information, as I have done so little visiting myself, do not many of our less fortunate sisters know that tailor-made gowns are just as expensive as frills and furbelows—take the sewing-women, for example?”

“I have no doubt the sewing-women do,” admitted the former speaker in a tone of extreme sadness; “perhaps they all do; one tells another, of course. Do you think a long, dark cloak would answer the purpose better? Is there not some way by which we might avoid suggesting the awful gulf that exists between the rich and the poor in this world? It is dreadfully depressing to have it blazoned forth by everything I wear! Take the weather of to-day, for instance. Of course, I *had* to take my boa and muff, and wear my sealskin besides, to get here at all. Well, on my way—it is only a step, you know, and I wanted the exercise—on the way I met two poor women that I visit. They were clad in the thinnest of shawls, and really, really I *did* wish I had left *some* of my furs behind! They must have felt the difference, poor old things—and how they did stare at me!”

A beautiful young matron stood up to make reply. She gazed at the ceiling with a heavenly expression.

“I think we are all in danger of falling into a very common error through our sympathies,” she began softly. “We are constantly making the mistake of judging the poor by ourselves. Just here we need more faith, more enlightenment. I am sure all of us believe that there is a law of compensation in the divine economy, do we not? I think we need to apply it in a practical way. We must not assume that the poor like what we like, and feel just as we feel in every particular. We *know* that they do not. As they cannot rise to the heights of refined enjoyment over the things that we enjoy, neither can

they sorrow over the tragedies of life as we sorrow over them. You see they have not the same sensibilities. We ought to be *thankful* they have not! It should increase our faith in God's wisdom and goodness every day!"

This eloquent plea produced a sensation. A rustle went through the audience and a look of relief was visible on nearly every face. But the young girl wearing the purple hat said doubtfully:

"But the cold—surely they feel cold and hunger just as we should?"

The young matron turned upon her the look of a seraph; no artist has ever yet achieved on painted canvas such a look of angelic tenderness—combining with it all the philosophy of the ages—as this beautiful young matron now cast upon the assembly.

"*Certainly they do not!* We must believe more firmly in the divine economy and realize that it is *we* who suffer for them; it is we who discuss their grievances and who build these halls that the wrongs of suffering humanity may be heard and adjusted! I often wonder if the poor who pass these doors would have any stirring of gratitude in their hearts if they should come to realize that these discussions are conducted solely for *their* benefit? But we need to bear in mind the great fact that if we permit our discussions to drift from the academic standpoint we shall certainly lose the power to benefit those whose cause lies in our hands. We must *not* descend to—" The speaker's tone was becoming sonorous and her expression transcendental as she gazed vaguely about the room, which was perhaps the reason why there came a timely interruption from the tactful chairman.

"Speaking of the 'academic tone' reminds me that the next meeting will be on the 'Negro Problem,' and that we shall need all our wits to preserve the tone of such a meeting, if we permit colored delegates to be present. The wife of a brave Confederate officer is to address us, you will remember, on the 'Causes of Lynchings and the Retrogression of the Negro Since the War.' Now I have here several petitions from colored persons who want to read papers 'in rebuttal,' they say; but it stands to reason that they cannot refute evidence that has not yet been presented. Shall we or shall we not allow these papers to be read?"

"At a meeting on the negro problem that I once attended," observed a soberly dressed little lady, "all the colored delegates present asked permission to present their grievances, and the whole time of the meeting was taken up with listening to a recital of them, so that not a single white person had a chance to say a word! The meeting was an absolute dead failure so far as any illumination of mind was concerned. Those colored

delegates went home without obtaining a single ray of light on their own problem—poor things!—and we were obliged to listen to the most tiresome examples of false reasoning. They had all schemed apparently to say the same thing: 'How is the negro to become industrious and self-supporting if he is persistently refused employment?' They seemed to be actually *hinting* at us to employ them! Imagine! And the result was that I had no chance to present my plea for 'Special Schools to Train Negroes in Habits of Industry'—none whatever!"

"I am sure we all thank the speaker for this graphic account of her experience which may well serve as a guide to us," said the chairman with gracious firmness. "We do not meet here to *employ* the negro—but merely to discuss him in a truly academic spirit—and this we can only do by keeping him out in person. When he realizes that we have his interests at heart—"

After the words "interests at heart" Julian heard no more; the speakers had begun to bewilder him with the usual doubt as to whether they could possibly be in earnest. Do the angels in heaven laugh or cry over such discussions? This one had passed the brink of the ludicrous and entered tragedy, he thought—and then the speaker, their theme and their absurdities were suddenly forgotten and swept out of sight.

A stranger, simply and unobtrusively clad, had stolen noiselessly into the rear of the audience. Her face was in shadow, although the richly-colored light from the casement fell on her bonnet and shoulders. Her profile drooped away from the audience; her cheek touched her gloved hand in an attitude of sorrowful meditation. Julian started as his eye fell upon her face. It was Marian!

She seemed to him to wear the air of one who in desperation seeks refuge in a sanctuary to escape the tortures of conscience. How sad, how mournful her whole expression! When she raised her eyes and looked directly at Julian, her glance said distinctly:

"I am unhappy—forgive—comfort me! Is there any comfort for me under heaven?"

Her glance smote him with all its former beauty and power. He groaned inwardly; he bowed his head, and sat without looking at her for some minutes. Why had Marian returned to the city? Why had she entered that lecture-room? Was she seeking *him*? And was he so bound by conventionalities that he could not speak to this conscience-stricken woman, that he could not offer her a word of guidance, that he could not stretch out a hand to help her—though it might be in his power to save her, even at this late hour?

His young cheek burned like a passionate coal on the hand upon which he was leaning it; while his veins were thrilling from that one look at her face, he resolved that he would not

look again. He would wait until he had regained control over himself. There would be time to speak to her after the meeting. But through all his self-control and his averted looks, his pulses were bounding with joy—with the unutterable joy of seeing her again. No wonder that he heard not a single word more of those mellifluous discussions! He was deaf and blind to everything but that one lovely presence.

Once more he turned and looked in the direction of Marian. She was not there—she had disappeared! Had she misunderstood his downcast looks? He would find her and explain!

The chairman was saying blandly as she looked at Julian, who was moving swiftly and silently toward the door of the lecture-room, "I think the discussion to-day has been most helpful; I only wish more could have heard it—and we still have time for a word from Mr. Endicott—"

CHAPTER XI.

Forced to stop, Julian turned quickly, conscious in spite of his disappointment that something within him was dimly rejoicing that his pursuit of Marian was now made out of the question.

He retraced his steps and ascended the platform, taking the position assigned to him by the chairman. An indignant protest was already in his heart against the assumption of inherent superiority which he recognized as the key-note of the discussions he had just overheard. It was indeed the cherished dogma on which the whole fabric of class distinctions are built. Could he not pierce the hide-bound complacency of these worldlings? At least he would try. So he poured forth his soul with an intense scorn of the detestable cant he had been listening to, quite regardless of the effect his words might produce on the audience or on the minds of his managers.

He asked them how they could presume to measure the needs of the poor if they regarded them as beings of a totally different order? Where and by whom had they been created different? What meaning was then left in their magnificent phrase, "the brotherhood of man?" And if they denied the fact of brotherhood themselves, how dared they preach it to the poor as a new gospel? Could any one present say that she had ever investigated the truth of this arbitrary ruling of the caste spirit? He could assure them that not a day passed that the poor did not investigate it to its utmost limits, and prove their own power to suffer all that humanity can suffer in this world.

"Let the poor be called in to testify in their own behalf what hunger and cold feel like—what overwork and disease and hopeless poverty feel like!" he cried with eyes flashing and a tumult of angry shame in his heart that he had chosen to be the hireling of these idle theorists.

"I beg of you to abandon this cruel philosophy which teaches

that God has made you different because he has permitted you to be more fortunate. Your long cloaks and your tailor-made gowns can never conceal the proud disdain in your hearts which works vastly more injury to the minds of the poor than the sight of your silks and furs can possibly do. If you go into the slums to learn the lesson of their patience, their strange acceptance of poverty and suffering as their lot in life, you will understand that these people do not feel *less* than you, but more. You will discover that they are making the same allowance for *your* lack of sensibility that you make for theirs—only I really believe with more real charity in their hearts than is found in yours!”

Now surely he had pierced the class egotism of these idle women. Surely he had rebuked them as becomes a moral reformer! Alas! Only too clearly was it made apparent that his words reached their ears as the mere lifeless formulas of his craft; they were no more to these women than the set phrases with which they repented in church of their sins—acknowledging that they like sheep had gone astray!

“Next Friday,” interrupted the chairman with an apologetic smile for Julian, while she pointed to the blackboard on which were outlined the studies of various classes for the coming week—“next Friday has been set apart for a tour through the slums—‘To Inspect the Tenement Life of the Abject Poor,’ during which we shall also give our course of free lectures on ‘How to Live on 15 Cents a Day’ and distribute our recipes for making ‘Soups without Meat,’ and ‘For Stewing Turnips and Cabbages without Causing Unpleasant Odors in the House.’ (She was quoting from the headlines on the blackboard). Having heard our secretary’s eloquent plea for a more sympathetic application of our principles of human brotherhood, it is hoped that all will embrace this opportunity and that we shall have the benefit of Mr. Endicott’s instruction besides. We really cannot think of making the tour without him.”

“You know I do not approve of intruding into these people’s homes,” protested Julian with distressful earnestness, “and by what standard of justice do we strive to teach them to make bricks without straw?—‘Soups without meat’—indeed!”

“We go to study their needs, and not one of them has ever raised an objection to our coming; and you know we never *give* them anything!”

“That is only their courtesy—their unfailing grace of hospitality. Good heavens, how blind, how totally blind is this spirit of class privilege! You seem to see the world upside down by it!”

“Class privilege?” repeated the chairman with a puzzled smile; “I really believe this is the first time we have heard those words in our halls. It reminds me that I am negotiating with

an eminent college professor to lecture next month on the 'False Reasoning of the Socialists,' so we may as well make ourselves familiar with the term 'class privilege,' for I believe it is one that the socialists constantly employ." She cast her eyes down for a second and then continued with careful deliberation:

"We must guard against the use of misleading terms. We appreciate"—she turned to Julian with a smile—"your enthusiasm—it is of inestimable value in our work. But you have often told us that your early life was passed where there was no poverty except that which was shared by all—the community—and consequently there was no organized helpfulness such as we find so important in the higher civilization of to-day. It is perhaps inevitable that you are hardly prepared to enter fully into that higher sense of obligation of which we are so deeply conscious. The only 'class privilege' that we know anything about is the privilege of ministering to the unfortunate! Some day you may understand this more fully than you do now. But in carrying out the aims of the Association our secretary (she now turned to her audience with a smile) has shown the deepest devotion to our ideals—an incredible amount of self-sacrifice! It is unavoidable that coming in such close contact as he does with the poor and the working classes, he should sometimes see things a little out of their true perspective; whereas it is *our* aim to see everything in right proportion, and in the highest harmony with the Divine will. When we do this in the true academic spirit, we are the better able to realize the meaning of the words, 'The poor ye shall have always with you,' for without them, how should we ever attain the true standard of disinterested devotion to the cause of humanity? Think how selfish and mean and *horrible* our lives would be if we had not the poor beside us always to make our hearts tender and stir within us the noble impulse to study their problems and needs! But all things have their uses, and I believe that our secretary can fulfil his part better if he does not quite comprehend the *whole* meaning of the great plan he is carrying out in our name. I assure you, his zeal and *personal* enthusiasm are quite indispensable to us." She finished by announcing that the meeting would now adjourn.

Julian stood where he was on the platform pondering her words. Had he been rebuked or praised—and why did she apologize for him? But presently the lady approached him with extended hand and her kindest greeting.

"Do not, I beg of you, let anything I said trouble you for an instant," she entreated. "We would not have you different from what you are. It was a little awkward that I had to explain your attitude to them. You see I was afraid that it might

be misunderstood—that *we* might be misunderstood, I mean. It all works together for the best—you being *as you are* is just what *we* want—what we must have.”

“But our point of view seems different,” objected Julian.

“Of course! It naturally would be, don’t you see? You would not be useful to us otherwise.”

“As a connecting link between you and the poor, it is better that I should be different?” questioned Julian in melancholy study.

“Exactly—different from *us*—not necessarily different from the others.” She smiled sweetly as if to lighten the harsh construction he might put on her words.

“Created as a different order of being, I may yet serve your aims without comprehending them because I am not so far removed as you are from the ‘lower classes’? Yes, I see—I understand. You are entirely right!—I *am* a different order of being from you—I am, I am!” They shook hands with every appearance of hearty good will, the lady not being in the slightest degree embarrassed by the wide-open stare of Julian’s eyes as he fixed them on her face. He parted from her with the remark:

“How delightful that you not only recognize this fact but accept it as proof of my increasing usefulness! I take this as evidence of great breadth of spirit on your part.”

“That is something we must all strive for,” she murmured, withdrawing rather hastily, perhaps vaguely suspicious of sarcasm in the young man’s words.

Julian then went home in great wretchedness of spirit. He was dissatisfied with himself, disgusted with the attitude of the Association and more than ever inclined to doubt the wisdom of his choice of philanthropy as a vocation. Very soon he fell to thinking about Marian and became supremely agitated, downcast and rebellious against fate for the remainder of that afternoon and evening.

Then to his delight he read in an evening paper that Mrs. Starling was a guest in the city and that her hostess had issued invitations for a box party at the opera the following week.

Resolutely as he set himself the next day to solve the problems of his work, the picture of Marian in an opera box, within sight of himself, formed a background on which all the realities of life painted themselves only to be extinguished by this alluring vision. He determined that he would attend the opera, but he would not go alone. He must see Marian, he must speak to her, but to fortify himself against the temptation of staying too long by her side he would take a companion, but whom?

Julian reached this conclusion while sitting behind the desk in the society’s office. He raised his eyes and found

Elizabeth regarding him with that singular expression of absorbed anxiety which he had noticed before.

Elizabeth's head drooped as her glance met his; she was merely absorbed in her work—her manner seemed to say—she was soon too deeply preoccupied to observe Julian's intense gaze. Her face cooled; she wrote more vigorously than ever. She belonged to a race that had borne heavy burdens. She could endure great self-repression and still live.

Julian was pleased with the thought that his guardianship over her had been of the most practical, beneficent kind. A brother could not have done more. She seemed to him an ideal younger sister, looking with affectionate eyes into her brother's face, and always ready to glow with pride over his achievements.

Elizabeth being such a good, helpful little sister should accompany him to the opera. It was hardly necessary to ask her consent before purchasing the tickets, for never yet had she refused a request of Julian's.

When he showed her the tickets her eyes opened very wide; she seemed on the verge of giving expression to some thought that stirred her deeply—probably it was gratitude—but she thought better of it, or perhaps could find no words suitable for an occasion so great. At any rate, she turned away abruptly and closed the interview.

Julian's country breeding left him unconscious of social transgression in thus planning to take Elizabeth to the opera. He had never been told the decree of the Eastern civilian—that young men and maidens may attend concerts together, but never operas without a chaperone. And of course Elizabeth, who had never known a chaperone in her life, was even more ignorant of conventional standards.

So the next week, Elizabeth and Julian attended the music-dramas which make up Wagner's Trilogy. In that enchanting world, like two unsophisticated children, they sorrowed together over the unhappy loves of Sigamund and Sigalinda. They wandered through the woods with the innocent Siegfried in his search for Brunhilde on the fire-encircled rock; they thrilled with poetic delight when the maid awoke to sing her beautiful invocation to light in response to his kiss. Finally, they mourned with her over his dead body and refused to be comforted when she cast herself upon his funeral pyre. Julian could not analyze his own bewildered absorption in the dominant and splendidly constructive power of the orchestra, by which he was delivered bodily into the hands of the supremest of all the arts and carried to the very mountain tops of poetic inspiration. The relief of getting out of himself was great, however, and the intensity of feeling portrayed suited well his overwrought imagination.

But during those three long evenings Julian caught only a momentary, unsatisfactory glimpse of Marian. He did not discover her box until he left his seat during one of the intermissions and swept the lower house repeatedly with his glasses. Unfortunately her face remained turned from him. Should he descend and speak to her? Might he not at least stand near by to gaze stealthily upon the beloved features, and if she had a message for him, would she not beckon to him that he might approach and help her? What was there to prevent? He happened to look back at Elizabeth. She had turned her face toward him. Her dark eyes seemed to be entreating his return. Slowly he went back to her.

Again he bought tickets for another night, and took pains to select seats in a part of the house facing the box in which Marian had been seated. He felt sure she would be there again, for "Tannhauser" was to be played next, and he knew it to be her favorite opera.

CHAPTER XII.

On the evening of the performance of "Tannhauser," Julian and Elizabeth mounted the stairs of the upper gallery and took their seats in one of the cheap stalls against the wall. The house was dark at first, but presently the dazzling electric lights revealed the fashionable throng of a great city. Julian watched with a shame-faced eagerness a certain box downstairs, until its occupants began to arrive as the orchestra started to play the overture.

From his safe retreat in this unfashionable part of the house he was able to stare unobserved through his opera glasses upon the face and form of Marian, whom he discovered in the rear of the box as if shrinking from the world's gaze. He thought she looked paler than usual. But presently she turned her head to respond to a greeting back of her, and a beautiful flush spread itself over her cheek; her smile shone as sweetly and spontaneously as ever. Apparently her eyes were full of the joyous light that Julian could not recall without a thrill of pain; they were looking into the eyes of a man whom he recognized at once as her "evil genius."

Breathlessly he watched every expression of her face. It was like looking at one who has risen from the dead—alas! who has not yet risen and is still among the dead—no, it was worse, for the dead do not smile with an exquisite tenderness meant for others; though they make fountains of our eyes they have not the power to stab to the heart as every play of Marian's features now stabbed Julian.

In the anguish of the moment, he turned away and looked into the face of Elizabeth. The startled expression of her large eyes held his gaze mysteriously for a second. He opened the

libretto of the opera and began to relate mechanically the story of "Tannhauser." But neither the printed page nor Elizabeth's eyes could hold his attention long. His heartsick glance flung itself once more across the house; it transcended space and gathered the beloved object close to his heart—and still, it was a thousand miles away! In the consciousness of eternal separation, he beheld Marian as distant and inaccessible—as beautiful and as near to him—as the lovely evening lamp of Venus when it touches the horizon.

To his relief the lights were suddenly lowered and Marian's face disappeared in the gloom of the amphitheatre. The curtain rose on the brilliant interior of the cave of Venus. Julian had not seen this opera before. He knew that it was composed on more conventional lines than Wagner's later works, and he imagined that he would enjoy it less. Its very title seemed vulgarized by association with rival breweries and street corner saloons. He looked and listened indifferently while he held the libretto between himself and Elizabeth, to whom he pointed out the English meaning of the German verse that the tenor was singing. The fame of this tenor was world wide; his voice and acting were magnificent and Tannhauser was said to be his greatest part.

Julian's eyes wandered mournfully over the darkened house in which a bejeweled and glittering audience still shone with a subdued glory, as if conscious that its right to dazzle was only momentarily suspended to enable a mimic stage to hold its own without danger of an eclipse. As his gaze passed from one row of dim, silent human beings to the next,—from the parquet to the parquet circle and on to the first tier above—he seemed to be looking down from a great altitude upon the human race of the nineteenth century.

What were they all but spectres, he thought, masquerading for an hour in the flesh and color of life? How strange they should ever forget that their home was under the ground—their natural lineaments those of the death's head and skeleton! How preposterous were all efforts to forget this fact! He for one in this assembly of living ghosts would not forget it. He knew that Marian and himself were spectres—nothing more; an immortal love might have made them worthy of immortal life—but now they sat as it were among the dead, drinking in the breath of decay with every heart throb; waiting their turn with the rest to descend into the arms of the vast, hated, hideous majority.

A sudden clap of thunder and the immediate darkness of the stage roused Julian from this unwholesome reverie. The song of the shepherd followed in the peaceful valley of Tannhauser's home. The scene was one of great beauty. Julian's eyes, riveted on the silent figure of the knight in the foreground,

were slowly captivated by its human personality. The chanting of the pilgrims in the distance chastened his heavy heart. When the knight kneeling before the footlights broke into his incoherent, remorseful cry: "*Great are the marvels of Thy mercy, O God!*" Julian felt that he was listening to the cry of the human soul in all ages; the great struggle between good and evil was apparent, and the noble theme carried the drama forward to its intense climax.

In passionate self-consciousness, Julian now entered into every pang of unavailing remorse that marked the backward gaze of the hero into his past revels. He forgot the young Elizabeth by his side in his absorbed contemplation of Elizabeth on the stage. He did not forget Marian, but he avoided looking at her more than once between the acts, when his eyes fixed themselves reluctantly and curiously upon her. Had the wonderful theme awakened no response in her soul? If he judged correctly the charming gaiety of her face and manner, it had not. There was absolutely no change in her expression. As he watched her, a chill fell upon him and he could not bear to look at her again.

The orchestra's mystic and deeply tragic prelude to the third act was like a voice speaking to Julian from the depths of the spirit world. Accusing memories of his neglected work assailed him with piercing cries. Through his infatuation, his high ideal of self-consecration had been dragging in the dust for many months!

But as the curtain rose upon the scene of Elizabeth clinging to the shrine, his egotistic self-abasement slowly forgot itself in the triumph of the religious principle. During Elizabeth's exquisite song, "*Er Kehrt nicht zurück,*" even the worldliness of the audience stood abashed before the climax of earthly sorrow and heavenly purification. Blasphemous now seemed to Julian the mouldy materialism which had spread itself like an ill-smelling pall over his thoughts early in the evening. Life had again triumphed over the eternal nothingness; the spirit having lifted man above the temptations of the flesh, self-sacrifice once more seemed glorious and set its shining seal upon renunciation as the secret of life.

Remembering Elizabeth by his side, Julian turned to her with a smile of comfort in the thought that she was still there. He looked at her; her eyes were full of tears. Her hands were clasped together; she had hardly stirred during the performance except to look from the libretto to the stage, backward and forward from time to time. It might be the death of Elizabeth—her namesake—that affected her so profoundly; the deep meaning of the opera that overwhelmed his guilty soul was surely lost upon this innocent girl. He hoped it was.

❁ SOCIALISM ABROAD ❁

Professor E. Untermann

ITALY.

Something new under this sun, Rabbi Ben Akiba notwithstanding! A monarch in favor of anti-monarchical socialists, and a bourgeois cabinet supported by revolutionaries! However, before getting ready to shake hands with comrade King Victor Emanuel, christian socialist, read what our old comrade Ferri said in the Chamber of Deputies: "Our present government is economical and political. . . . The ideal of the proletariat is collectivism. . . . The means by which we endeavor to attain this ideal is the class struggle. . . . The socialization of property is irreconcilable with monarchical rule. . . . The bullet and barricades may bring about a change in the political system, but never a change in the economic conditions. This change requires a gradual development. . . . The cabinet Zanardelli has taken to heart the lessons of the last campaigns: it proposes to maintain a neutral attitude toward the irresistible labor movement and to respect liberty. . . . It is simply a question of tactics. Either the reactionary parties bar our way—then all responsibility falls on their shoulder. Or they must permit the normal transition from feudalism to bourgeois liberalism in a peaceful and legal way. It is to the interest of the proletariat that this transition take place unhampered. Therefore we shall support the ministry."

The general committee of the socialist party defines its position in these words: "In harmony with the parliamentary group we express our conviction that we cannot place the least confidence in a government which is the representative of class interests directly opposed to those of the proletariat. But in view of the present political and economic condition of the country, the parliamentary group is authorized to consent to such measures and reforms as tend to further the normal development of the class struggle and the interests of the proletariat."

If you want to gauge the strength of the socialist movement of a country, watch the attitude of the government and the comments of the capitalist press. "In many parts of the country," writes the Berliner Boersen Courier, "even in the North of Italy, the members of the leghe di resistenza (leagues of resistance formed by farm laborers) wear the photographs of the socialist leaders on their hats or on their breasts. They kiss these photographs and reverence them like they did the Madonna or the holy Antonius of Padua until quite recently. . . . When one of these leagues orders a strike, the landowners cannot introduce foreign laborers, for this would lead without fail to bloodshed. The authorities know this and prefer to leave the strikers in possession of the field."

This is the key that opens the secret of the king's conversion. The misery and wretchedness of millions of Italians, the groans of the oppressed, the demands of civilization, all these do not move his heart.

But when the socialists grow so strong that the monarchy is threatened, then the old Bismarckian game of state socialism is played, in order to act for a little while longer a useless and purely ornamental part in society. The king's own words convey a world of information to socialists: "It can't be helped. The interest of my house may demand some day a ministry that shall contain a republican or a socialist." With grim candor writes Innominatus in the *Chicago Tribune*, July 15th: "By becoming democratic the monarchy would give itself a longer lease of life. To drive a people thirsting for reform it was necessary to become its guide. . . . The house of Savoy is playing its last trump; will it win? For the moment the ministry has things its own way. . . . It is hatred of the Pope; it is the instinct of self-preservation. God will not bless such shameless and cynical commercialism." Calm yourself, Innominatus. Neither the King nor the Pope will win. Socialism stands at the gate of the new era and says to them: "*Lasciate ogni speranza! Abandon all hope!*"

BELGIUM.

The class struggle is rapidly lining up on one side those elements of Belgian society that fight for freedom, progress and enlightenment under the banners of the proletariat, on the other side those who stand for wage slavery, profits in perpetuity and intellectual darkness. And the name of the loadstone that sifts the forces of light and darkness is Universal Suffrage. All indications point to a speedy approach of the acute stage when a violent crisis must cleanse the body social of its impure elements.

Who holds the control of the fighting forces? That is the important question at this moment. The clerical Gazette reassures the government by affirming that the militia will not refuse to serve and obey the officers against whom it revolted quite recently. However, the humorous and serene comment of *Le Peuple* leaves little doubt about the true state of affairs:

"Everything will go its accustomed course," says our contemporary. Hm, hm, we should not feel too sure about that. Our friends of the Gazette ought to remember that militia men entered the *Maison du Peuple* holding the butts of their rifles up in the air. But as our liberal friends are so well informed, could they not instruct the government on the state of mind of the real soldiers, the sons of the people? If necessary, we could show our liberal friends a few reports of meetings held by socialist soldiers."

Lieutenant-General Tournay, of the militia in Tournai, lately called the officers of his corps together and instructed them in the "rules for upholding law and order during strikes." In conclusion he said: "It is probable that riots will shortly break out on account of the universal suffrage. The militia must be ready to suppress them!"

"What signifies this aggressive language?" asks *Le Peuple*, with mock surprise. "The country is calm, profoundly calm. Has Mr. Tournay been intrusted by the government with the mission of agent provocateur? By using such language he admits that the obstinate resistance of the clerical government to the legitimate and just universal suffrage, which is the desire of the majority of the population, might at a certain moment create grave trouble. And he counts on the militia to suppress this demand and drown it with blood. However, may the brave general entertain no illusions and curb his bloody ardor, old bedizened brute that he is. The members of the militia

are mostly citizens, like all of us, and like the overwhelming majority, they are in favor of universal suffrage. If Mr. Tournay should attempt to hurl them against those who wish to obtain the very reforms which they themselves want, he might cut his own flesh and find that he would have to execute his own orders. He has no doubt sense enough not to do that. So much is certain, when the services of the militia men of Tournay are required, the standard they will follow will not be his old leather breeches."

The country is calm, but it is the calm before the outbreak of the cyclone. The storm announces its coming in the following lines of *Le Peuple*:

"'No referendum will be taken,' that is the cry of the clericals. Does that mean the country will not find a way to express its will? Of course, the citizens will no longer express their will by going in a quiet and orderly way to the ballot box and returning to their homes with a sense of duty well performed. The clericals want a fight. But so much are we accustomed to see reactionary governments give way only to force and fear, that nobody is disturbed by such an alternative. Matters will be settled all the more quickly, as a well planned harmony exists between the revolutionaries and the troops that are to suppress them, and no Belgian officer dares to deny this. . . . In a few days, perhaps in a few hours, the country will know and nail to the pillory the names of those conservative politicians who seem intent on proclaiming by their vote that all legal avenues are closed to the defenders of universal suffrage."

A heated discussion of the Tournai incident took place in the Chamber of Deputies, and one socialist deputy threatened to kill General Tournay in case of an uprising.

Even capitalist papers admit that universal suffrage is inevitable "No matter what we may think of this reform," says *Le Soir*, "it is an illusion to assume that universal suffrage can be avoided by the help of speeches or otherwise. . . . Evolution is the law of the world, and those are the real revolutionaries who attempt to bar the way of incessantly advancing humanity."

The proposition to submit universal suffrage to a referendum was defeated by a vote of 85 against 50; two deputies abstained from voting. The names of those who voted against the referendum are published in all the socialist newspapers. Immediately after the result of the vote was known the general committee of the socialist party held a special meeting for the purpose of deciding on the next step. The result of this meeting was a manifesto addressed "To the People," outlining the situation in bold strokes and concluding with these words: "True to its tactics, the Parti Ouvrier declares that it will use all legal and peaceful means for obtaining universal suffrage. When these means are exhausted, it will not hesitate to take revolutionary measures."

A significant result of the growing socialist strength is the marked inclination of the clericals to bestow the franchise on women, in the openly avowed intention of profiting by the influence of the clergy over this politically uneducated half of the population. The socialists, well aware that the franchise will prove an education to women as it did to men, will gladly accept this present from the clericals and thank them for their trouble.

The inauguration of the *maison du peuple* in Vilvorde was the occasion of a great socialist demonstration in favor of universal suffrage. *Le Peuple* sees in this first rural people's palace the beginning of the conquest by socialists of the vast mass of country people by the help of economic improvements and education. Other large villages will also have their *maisons du peuple* in the near future. Not

the least service rendered to the socialist cause by these institutions is that of teaching women the importance of co-operation between laborers and of transforming them into enthusiastic workers for socialist propaganda.

FRANCE.

The luckless little band of radicals who no longer find a place of refuge in the reactionary parties, and who furnish us no end of amusement by trying to avoid their being swallowed by the rising tide of socialism, recently held their annual congress in Paris. They are interesting only because they and the Bernsteinian compromise and immediate measure wing of socialists are gradually approaching one another. Their ludicrous position, as defined by one of their spokesmen in *La Dépêche*, needs no further comment: "I admit frankly that the substitution of one class for another has no charm for us. We don't feel any desire to exchange the demands and tyranny of capital for the caprice and oppression of labor. We wish decidedly that labor should receive its full reward, but . . . under the impartial authority of a state representing everybody." National socialism with the competitive system retained versus Proletarian collectivism. The same old, old will o' the wisp. While these men are nursing their misty dreams the capitalistic *Le Soleil* denounces the "despot Millerand," who, "drunken with his unexpected success," wishes to unite in his person the executive, legislative and judiciary power. The unhappy congregations suffering from the blow of the law on the associations received another kick from *Allemane*, whose resolution to suppress the congregations will be introduced by the parliamentary group of socialists. Eight thousand building trades members are on strike in Cannes, and the socialists of Havre, where the bourgeois employers have closed the *bourse du travail* and locked out 8,000 union members, appeal to the comrades of the nation for funds to build their own *maison du peuple*.

HOLLAND.

The elections for the parliament resulted in a gain of three new seats for our comrades. Seven out of the ten districts contested by the socialists were carried by the following candidates: J. H. Schaper, 2 districts; Van der Zwaag, 2 districts; H. Van Kol, K. Ter Laan, G. Melchen, one district each. The election of Troelstra on one of the supplementary ballots in Schaper's or Van der Zwaag's spare districts is almost certain. The total socialist vote amounted to 11,625. The majority in the Chamber is now held by 25 catholics, 23 protestant anti-revolutionists, 6 free anti-revolutionists and 2 historical christians. The opposition is composed of 27 liberals, 8 radicals and 7 socialists.

AUSTRIA.

By the election of comrade Dr. Victor Adler with 4,298 socialist votes in Favoriten, the 10th district of Vienna, the Austrian comrades have gained their first seat in the Landtag, the parliament of German Austria, and won a doubly significant victory. For the franchise for these elections is restricted to persons paying at least 7 kronen 20 kreuzer (\$1.50), and this was the first socialist candidate for the Landtag.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes

A crisis appears to be confronting trade unionism in this country. The long-threatened contest between the iron and steel workers and the billion dollar trust has come. About 75,000 men walked out of the plants controlled by the United States Steel Corporation on July 15. Their immediate grievance was the refusal of the combine to allow its non-union mills to be unionized. Several months ago the issue was first made in a preliminary skirmish in a combine mill at McKeesport, Pa. After several days of fighting the trouble was patched up until after the national convention of the Amalgamated Association. When the convention adjourned the association's officers, acting under instructions, made a formal demand that the union scale be signed for the "open" mills, and that they be allowed to organize the employees. After several days of negotiating three of the "constituent" companies of the billion-dollar octopus refused the request and thereupon the men went out.

For upward of a year the mill-owners have steadily attempted to encroach upon labor organizations by offering employees extraordinary inducements to remain out of the unions, following the policy of Carnegie. The scheme was transparent enough upon its face. During slack periods the non-union mills were to be kept running, while the plants in which union men were employed were to be closed, and by this putting a premium on non-unionism it was hoped to destroy every vestige of organization and place the magnates in a position where they would not be harassed by labor demands during their campaign to secure control of the world's markets.

So the Amalgamated Association is fighting for its life, and it is not improbable that affiliated organizations will be drawn into the struggle if it is prolonged any length of time and the battle waged all along the line.

It is barely possible that, after the mills have been closed a week or two to make necessary repairs, the magnates will hold out the olive branch and make some sort of concessions in order to fill its orders and await a more favorable opportunity, when business becomes slack, to strike a death-blow at organized labor. I am informed by a person in New York, who comes in contact with some of the big bosses, that this line of action is advocated by some of the heavy stockholders. They do not want to lose too many dollars that are in sight.

The strike of the firemen in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania for an eight-hour day; the strike of the molders in Chicago for higher wages, in defiance of the wishes of their national officers, and which inaugurates a second great struggle with the National Foundrymen's Association; the bitter fight that the machinists are still putting up against the combined bosses in a number of places, and the mutterings of miners, railway workers and other laborers in different parts of the country, all portend an industrial crisis of mammoth propor-

tions in the near future. The present troubles may be adjudicated, but the war of extermination will be simply postponed.

The employing class of this nation has decided that organization of labor is inimical to its interests. It believes its mission is to become the greatest power in the world. Morgan is to the capitalists of America what Caesar was to the armies of the Roman Empire and what Napoleon was to the armies of France—a conqueror.

"The capitalists of this country have absolute and implicit faith in all that Morgan does," said a New York newspaper man who knows whereof he speaks to me recently. "If Morgan came forward with a proposition to finance a railway to the moon he could raise the capital. When he stepped ashore the other day after his trip to Europe his friends were inspired with such confidence that stocks increased in value one hundred million dollars!"

As the various industries—iron, steel, coal, copper, oil and so on—are becoming more thoroughly linked together, it stands to reason that labor must become more compactly organized, that the old "autonomy" feature of trade unionism must be dumped overboard and industrial unity must take its place, and that alleged leaders who would block the way to a "sticking together" must be sent to the rear.

Furthermore, since the courts are constantly at the beck and call of union-smashing capitalists, and legislators spurn the pleadings of labor for relief from injunctions, blacklists, militia and other oppressions of capitalism, the time has come when workingmen must cease throwing away their political power on demagogical politicians in the two old parties, but wheel in line with the Social Democratic party and place class-conscious men from their own ranks into the various branches of government to safeguard their interests, overthrow the tyrannical capitalist system and inaugurate social democracy.

The Western Labor Union, a strong federation of organized workers west of the Mississippi, has taken some heed of the centralization of capital, the smashing of labor laws, the hurling of injunctions and the calling out of the militia during labor troubles. The W. L. U. is less stubborn or stupid than some national bodies, and the object lessons taught by capitalism are not lost. At its recent convention in Denver the Western Labor Union adopted resolutions declaring that "the capitalist class is in complete possession of the means of production, and thereby controls the Republican, Democratic and Populist Parties to further its political and industrial ends," and that "the working class has nothing in common with the capitalist class, either politically or industrially," and that "we take such steps politically as to completely separate as a political body from all parties controlled by the capitalist class . . . and that the incoming executive board put forth every effort to assist the working people of the different states in furthering and establishing the political movement as above outlined." The Western Federation of Miners, controlling the mineral workers of the West, also adopted the foregoing resolutions. Of course, this action will not please Messrs. Hanna or Bryan, or some alleged labor leaders, but it nevertheless shows that the westerners are still bold, manly people who refuse to bend the pregnant hinges of the knee.

Readers of this department will no doubt have noticed that whenever striking machinists have gone back to work in a town here and there without securing the nine-hour day the daily press heralded that fact far and wide with big headlines. But where the men won their

demands the facts were either suppressed or shoved into some obscure corner of the dailies. The truth is that the machinists have won the nine-hour day quite generally. Where they lost in one place they gained most or all of their demands in ten. It is, of course, quite natural that losses should be met with in some cities, especially in those poorly organized. There never was a trade that successfully introduced the shorter workday everywhere and at the same time by a strike. The machinists are simply meeting with the same obstacles that other unions met. But order is coming out of chaos, and there is no doubt but the settlement of the fight in many cities and towns in favor of the workers means that the more stubborn bosses will be brought to time in the near future, as the full strength of the organization can be centered on them until their losses become so great that they will be forced to yield. The nine-hour day is here for the machinists, and in many places the men are discussing the advisability of following up their advantages by moving for an eight-hour day. It is worthy of notice, also, that in at least a dozen cities where the fight is hottest the employers appealed to the courts to protect them, and the judicial politicians, true to their capitalistic instincts, issued blanket injunctions against the strikers. It would appear from this situation that the machinists ought to have the intelligence to understand that there is a class struggle on, and that it is likewise to their interest to vote the capitalistic politicians out of office and place class-conscious workingmen on guard—that is to withdraw from the old parties and join the Social Democratic Party.

Two inventors in Warrenton, Ill., have built a rotary engine, at a cost of but \$75, that competent authorities claim will revolutionize motive power. They have been offered \$50,000 for the American patent, which they refuse. It is stated that the new engine will cause a shaft to make 2,000 revolutions a minute, which would be sufficient speed to drive a locomotive at the rate of 480 miles an hour if the train could be kept on the rails.—A rotary type-making machine has been invented in England, which casts 60,000 letters an hour, as against an average of 3,000 under the present system. The new device is especially designed for job printing establishments, as it will cast any size of type, and its operation is so swift and withal so inexpensive that it may be cheaper to make new type than to distribute the old.—An Ohio man has perfected an automatic bag-making machine which will be a great saving to flour, cereal, salt and other manufactories as well as bonanza farmers.—A new street sweeper attached to an automobile has come out, and they say that the faster it runs the cleaner it sweeps. Another sweeper attached to a street car is on the market.—A Massachusetts man has perfected a camera which, it is claimed, will preserve colorings and largely revolutionize lithography.—In Virginia a tobacco stemming machine has been put into operation that will dispense with 50 per cent of labor, ultimately displacing about 10,000 workers.

While this magazine is being printed the socialist hosts of America will be gathering in Indianapolis to finally unite the scattered factions of the country. From present appearances both the adherents of the Chicago and Springfield executive heads will be largely represented, as well as numerous state and local independent bodies. The new party, if all ends well, will be able to enter the field this fall with at least 15,000 dues-paying members, about forty newspapers and scores of able speakers. It is also quite probable that if amalgamation takes place

many able men who are sympathetic with the socialist movement, but have up to the present held aloof on account of petty squabbles, will lend their support to the united party. Certain it is that the reform parties, viewed from a political or economic standpoint, have no future before them, and that the S. D. P. is the most promising third party in the United States. The questions that will arouse the most discussion are those of form of organization, party name, seat of national headquarters and whether or not the "immediate demands" should be discarded. It is reported that committees from reform parties will also be present to urge some sort of combination with their organizations, but it is doubtful whether anything will be done in this direction.

At least thirty injunctions of the blanket variety have been swung at workmen by the courts during the past months. Many trades are affected, including machinists, molders, miners, waiters, etc., and the injunctions are more far-reaching than ever before. The men are not only restrained from picketing and boycotting, but are commanded not to visit homes of non-unionists to persuade them to stop work and not to talk to others regarding specific labor troubles, or to do aught to injure the business of the plaintiff, and so forth. The fact that the courts are working overtime to assist capitalists who are at war with organized labor is a pretty safe indication that trade unionism is growing more powerful despite all obstacles. A further result will be that those same trade unionists will soon be forced to the conclusion that they possess no standing in court and have no political power, and that they will line up at the polls with a party of their class and prepare to take control of the governing forces.

The semi-annual dividends on July 1 resulted in about one hundred million dollars of wealth flowing into the coffers of a few dozen multi-millionaires, as "wages of superintendence," of course. Rockefeller is reported to have cleaned up \$40,000,000, and the Goulds, Vanderbilts, Morgan and others also received large sums, which are being re-invested in railways, mines, mills, steamship lines and other properties. Many new trusts have been formed and old ones strengthened by the absorption of independent plants, and international combinations are increasing in number. Morgan is putting the finishing touches on his transportation combine that will encircle the globe; the mammoth soft coal trust is assuming shape; the tobacco branches are being welded together, and many other vast enterprises are being worked out by the magnates. Hardly a financial transaction is spoken of nowadays without the names of Rockefeller or Morgan are associated therewith, and these gentlemen are building more wisely than they know.

After considerable lobbying to secure the enactment of an employers' liability law, which, wonderful to relate, proved successful, the Colorado trade unionists were saddened by the report that somehow the bill got "lost" before it could be engrossed. What politician was responsible for "losing" the bill has not been determined. All that is known is that the bill continues to stay "lost."—The Pennsylvania miners are saying the "saggiest" things against the members of the legislature because all their bills were turned down, while the Michigan miners are not only denouncing the tricky old party politicians, but their executive board has issued a manifesto declaring that it is a

waste of time and money to attempt to secure any relief from the capitalistic parties, and the working people are called upon to elect class-conscious men from their ranks to the Legislature, when their rights can be secured and protected.

Reformers in Baltimore have launched a so-called Federate Socialist Party to agitate for municipal ownership and similar palliatives, and the Social Reform Union, with headquarters in New York, is taking a referendum vote on the proposition of starting a socialist party on the lines of the British Fabians.—The Public Ownership Party of St. Louis has spread out as a state organization in Missouri, but not sufficient enthusiasm has as yet been engendered to gain a foothold in other states.—The Populist Party is to hold a conference in Kansas City in September to discuss the question of re-organization, the fusion element in Kansas and other states having been repudiated by the democrats. It is not believed, however, by close students of political affairs that the reform parties will succeed in resurrecting themselves.

It looks as though another fight over the question of "autonomy" is coming. This time the seafaring workers are likely to mix it up. At last month's convention of the International Longshoremen's Union, in Toledo, it was decided to absorb the engineers, firemen, seamen and other branches of tollers along the lakes. The seamen have quite a strong union, and they have recently reached out for all who work on board of a boat and come in conflict with other nationals. The new move of the longshoremen will consequently start more discussion regarding the jurisdiction of national bodies now organized.—The leather workers at Philadelphia combined various branches and start out with a membership of 8,000, and administer a swift kick to "trade autonomy."

Western railway employes fear that they are going to be forced into a struggle with the corporations. The Southern Pacific has notified some of the brotherhood men that agreements will be annulled after sixty days, and this sudden notification is interpreted as the beginning of a move to destroy organization on transcontinental lines. In California a union similar to the A. R. U. is reported as having been formed and rapidly growing in strength. Railway workers in the East are also dissatisfied on some lines and on others they fear they will be dragged into fights by the striking metal workers and dissatisfied miners.

Ohio unionists are somewhat perturbed because a Dayton manufacturing company has begun suit for \$25,000 damages against organized men, individually and collectively, for being boycotted. If the company wins, it will be useless for workingmen to struggle for "little homes," for they can be sold out at any time.

The Chinese exclusion act lapses next year, and Western union men fear that the Washington politicians will not re-enact the law, as many American capitalists are very partial to Chinese labor.

SOCIALISM AND RELIGION

Professor George D. Herron

THE END OF THE GODS

I.

When the gods are dead to rise no more, man will begin to live.

After the end of the gods, when there is nothing else to which we may turn, nothing left outside of ourselves, we shall turn to one another for fellowship, and behold! the heart of all worship is exposed, and we have omnipotence in our hands;

For fellowship is man's true lord and only heaven—the divinest power the universe holds and the divinest glory our eyes shall ever look upon—and all that has gone or that shall yet go before us is but to prepare the way of fellowship.

It is fellowship our untaught and stumbling souls have sought for in the gods, and by the kiss of fellowship have the gods always betrayed us to our destroyers.

It is by keeping men from fellowship that the gods have reigned, and by hiding the might and faith that are in fellowship have the gods preserved their thrones.

But when to the doors of life men come with the key of fellowship, every secret of the universe will be given up, and there will be no place for the gods to dwell in.

II.

In the depth of human need will the key of fellowship be found, for the fate of humanity is wrapped up in its weakest members.

The downmost man is the savior to whom mankind must turn, for he is the little child who is to lead the world to fellowship, and to the strifeless progress of the dreamers.

When society at last sits at the feet of its despised and its worthless and its ignorant, to learn from them the way and the truth and the life of fellowship, it shall receive power to enter into its rest through the flaming gates of equality.

III.

There will be no more priests nor rulers nor judges, when fellowship comes and the gods are gone;

And when there are neither priests nor rulers nor judges, there will be no evil in the earth, nor none called good to stand over against others called evil;

For the priests and rulers and judges are the authors and preservers of evil;

It is by dividing men into good and evil that these have made themselves to be priests and rulers and judges, and so by their own shamelessness exalted themselves upon the separation and shame of their brothers.

Evil is but the lack of fellowship, and the lack of fellowship is the whole of evil.

There will be neither good nor evil when fellowship comes, nor great nor small, but all will be equals, judging not nor being judged, each to the other a shrine and a prayer, and a sure and perfect pledge of freedom.

IV.

Freedom is the ever-lost while ever-pursued because we seek it in the storm or on the height, or in the solitary places of self-will.

In none of these is freedom found, but rather where these are not.

Freedom is fellowship, and save in fellowship there is no freedom.

It is because fellowship is not that masters and tyrants are.

When fellowship at last appears,

When the long rule of yesterday and the fierce dread of tomorrow no more separate us from one another,

When we see our life as it is by falling in love with the great whole,
Then will come freedom—

Freedom to live, each man his life, full-blossomed and original;

Freedom to love, each man his own;

Freedom to work, each man after the pattern that is in his soul—

And the soul at home, after the wild, sad journey through the wilderness of the gods, almost endless—

At home, and the red torments of the journey lost in the ecstasy of self-forgetfulness.



BOOK REVIEWS



Social Control, A Survey of the Foundations of Order. Edward A. Ross, Ph. D. - Macmillan Co. Half leather, 463 pp., \$1.25.

Professor Ross has here done an extremely valuable piece of social analysis. He has set forth in great detail the elements that give continuity and regularity to the working of social institutions. The author states (p. 293): "The thesis of this book is that from the interactions of individuals and generations there emerges a kind of collective mind, evincing itself in living ideals, conventions, dogmas, institutions, and religious sentiments which are more or less happily adapted to the task of safeguarding the collective welfare from the ravages of egoism." It will be seen that in this very sentence he has no conception of an egoism which might be identical with the "collective welfare." He takes up and analyzes with a wonderful wealth of illustration all the means whereby social control is secured and order maintained. He points out the social function performed by public opinion, law, belief, social suggestion, education, custom, religion, personal ideals, ceremony, art, personality, illusion, and all other possible means of "social control." At times he seems to confuse "class control" for the benefit of a parasitic section of society, with "social control" for the benefit of the social whole. But when he comes to the chapter on "Class Control" he clears this point up in a masterly manner. This chapter is especially suggestive to socialists, as the following quotations will show: "It was shown in an earlier chapter that inhibiting impulses radiate not only from the social mass, but also from certain centers of extraordinary prestige and influence. Control of this kind is still social; but when the chief center of such inhibition is a class living at the expense of the rest of the community, we no longer have social control in the true sense, but class control. This may be defined as the exercise of power by a parasitic class in its own interest.

"There are various devices by which a body of persons may sink their fangs into their fellows and subsist upon them. Slavery, that is the immediate and absolute disposal of the labor force of another, is the primary form of this parasitic relation. By modifying this into serfdom the parasitic class, without in the least abating its power of securing nourishment from others, places itself in a position more convenient to it and less irritating to the exploited. . . . Finally the institution of property is so shaped as to permit a slanting exploitation under which a class is able to live in idleness by monopolizing land or other indispensable means of production."

He then goes on to show the means which are used by an exploiting class to keep its slaves in peaceful submission, and gives a most interesting and instructive suggestion. They permit the ablest of the slaves to attain a degree of success for "The heaving and straining of the wretches pent up in the hold of a slaver is less if a few of the most redoubtable are now and then let up on deck . . . No

people will toil and sweat to keep a class in idleness and luxury unless cajoled or compelled to do so. The parasitic class, therefore, is always a ruling class, and utilizes as many as it can of the means of control. . . . The props of parasitic rule . . . are force, superstition, fraud, pomp and prescription."

The work is very scholastic in its treatment and lacks coherency of view. The author does not seem to think of the possibility of a common factor or cause lying back of the phenomena which he traces and giving unity and order to the whole. The only glimmer he seems to have had of this fact is seen in the statement that "the changes that rack the social frame and so lead to a tightening of all the nuts and rivets in it are nearly all connected with economic conditions." Perhaps the gravest defect in it, especially to the socialist, is seen in the fact that while he gives a very extensive bibliography, much of which has little relation to the subject matter of the book, no reference whatever is made to books written by socialist writers, many of whom have covered, with equal research, the ground upon which he is working. No reference is made to the Communist Manifesto in the chapter on class control, although that set forth many of his positions in much the same language fifty years and more ago. He has evidently never heard of Marx, Engels, Lafargue, Loria or Kautsky, although he has unconsciously accepted much of their work which has filtered down to him through their influence on current thought. Taking the book as a whole, it is one which no student can afford to ignore, and the defects are such as not to mar its value to the actual seeker after information.

Collectivism and Industrial Evolution. Emile Vandervelde. Translated from the French by Charles H. Kerr. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 199 pp. 50 cents; paper, 25 cents.

The author explains in his preface to the present American edition that he has written the book to answer the question so often met by socialist workers, "Will you please direct me to a good summary of your teachings?" That he has succeeded in supplying the long felt want suggested by that question we believe few readers will deny. He has produced a work that is at once scientific in its positions, comprehensive in treatment, and yet so simple in language as to be easily understood, and sufficiently condensed to permit of thorough reading even by the busiest of men. It is not too much to say that this book is destined to become the text-book of international socialism. It has already been translated into nearly all modern European languages, although it has been published less than a year.

The introduction lays down the basic principles of socialism and gives the general thesis of the book. Then follows an able and exhaustive study of the process of capitalist concentration, the decadence of personal property, and the progress of capitalist property. The objections that have been offered to the basic principles of socialism are taken up and discussed and their weakness exposed. This is the point where most books on socialism written by socialists end. Very few of the really scientific socialist writers have attempted much of anything constructive. They have left this work for the utopians, who have generally made a sorry mess of it. But the time has now come when the socialist can begin to project many of the lines of social evolution into the future and can give more satisfying answers than formerly to questions concerning the methods of socialization and co-operative management. Prof. Vandervelde takes up and discusses these questions in the latter half of the book. He examines the present claims of the capitalist to a share in the social product, and shows all

such claims to be baseless. He then examines into "The advantages of Social Property," and shows the tremendous gain that must come from this next step in social evolution. He meets the anarchist and the "tyranny of the majority" as well as the "paternalistic" government argument in the chapter on "The Administration of Things." Those who are worrying about whether the socialists advocate confiscation will find the whole matter thoroughly discussed in the chapter on "The Means of Realization," and there is scarcely an objection to the ideal of socialism that is not met in the final chapter. This is the very book that all socialists have been waiting for, to read for themselves and to give to the hoped for convert.

Imperialism and Liberty. Morrison I. Swift. The Ronbroke Press, Los Angeles, Cal. Cloth, 500 pp. \$1.50.

This is certainly the most extensive view as well as the most scorching denunciation of the subject of imperialism that has yet appeared in print. The hollow hypocrisy of the claims of the philanthropists are exposed and imperialism shown to rest entirely upon the demand for wider markets on the part of plutocratic rulers. The part played by the press, and especially that portion of it that is now pretending to be most active in its opposition to plutocracy in bringing on the war with Spain, is clearly set forth. Of McKinley's alleged reluctance to enter upon war he says: "He held on to his stock of national peace and honor until he thought he would lose if he held it any longer, and then he threw it on the market and stepped from under." The author sees no hope in the "New Democracy," because "in the face of history, reason, and the torch of progress it says, Break up trusts; the Republican party catches the trick and reverberates, Break up trusts. There is no adequacy in this principle, nor is it even a principle. Progress and principle together say, Save the trust and nationalize it." But the author utterly lacks the honesty to point out that the only party that is saying this very thing in the political world is the socialist party. As a text-book on the subject of imperialism, as a rather highly strung rhetorical indictment of this one phase of capitalism, this book is certainly extremely valuable. As a social study it is manifestly deficient. There is but a glimmer of the fact that imperialism is but one expression of class rule and but a natural and inevitable result of production for a competitive market.

Woman: Her Quality, Her Environment, Her Possibility. Martha Moore Avery. Boston Socialist Press, 37 Maywood street, Boston. Paper, 29 pp. 10 cents.

A discussion of woman's economic position under capitalism and an appeal to her to throw off the slavery under which she suffers. An excellent propaganda pamphlet for work among women.

AMONG THE PERIODICALS

"The Revolution in Agriculture," by Prof. L. H. Bailey, of Cornell University, in the *World's Work*, is an exposition of the education now being carried on in agriculture, and especially in Cornell University. Perhaps the most significant passage is the one showing the appearance of an "intellectual proletariat" in agriculture. "Time was when

the two year man could hope for a position in an agricultural college or an experiment station, but the struggle for existence is now too severe. There are not positions enough for them all, and in the long run the fittest win and persist. Even the graduate of a four-years' course now stands little chance of securing the good positions in the institutions; he must have had at least one post-graduate degree." Booker T. Washington tells of the work of Hampton Institute, where he is using most excellent educational methods to produce more efficient wage slaves. He declares that "the first object of Hampton was to make the negro student appreciate the difference between forced and free labor." But as his idea of "free labor" is wage slavery, one can hardly wish him success in his teachings.

The Ethical Record distinguishes itself by publishing an article defending "The Moral Effects of Militarism in Germany," which contains about as many lies and as much rot as it is possible to get into the same number of words. Nothing is said of the way in which that army has syphlized whole cities, or of the magnificent results of this "moral training" shown in the recent war in China, as revealed by the notorious "Hun letters." It would seem like a strange commentary on an "Ethical Society" to appear as the apologist for what is perhaps the most rotten thing in the whole festering mass of capitalistic society.

H. G. Wells writes in the North American Review on "Certain Social Reactions, An Experiment in Prophecy," that contains some very suggestive discussions of ways in which housekeeping could be lightened by a proper application of labor-saving machinery. He shows how servants are destined to disappear, and how the occupation of housekeeping can be rendered light, pleasant and attractive. The article, although evidently intended to be socialistic, is so marred by a ridiculous Fabianism and a disregard of all facts and laws of evolution as to be much less valuable than might have been possible. His idea of the future society is a sort of middle class purgatory, an apotheosis of mediocrity, and aggregation of social and economic compromises.





EDITORIAL



NEW TENDENCIES IN AMERICAN SOCIALISM

That the present moment is a critical one in the history of the socialist movement in America is a commonplace. Every observer has noticed that both within and without the socialist organizations, the influences that affect the socialist movement appear to be approaching a climax. Whether this condition will continue to grow more acute for some time to come no one can say. But it would seem probable that the Indianapolis convention would mark the turning point. Coming as it does at such a crucial time, that convention will perhaps mark the beginning of the greatest setback it is possible for a movement resting on economic development to receive or, as we all hope, the date from which the socialist movement will have shown itself large enough to effectively cope with an industrialism, whose rotten ripeness has prepared the way for a new social organization.

One thing is sure, and that is that in the midst of the most tremendous, political, social and industrial chaos the world has ever known, the one center of intelligent evolution is to be found in the developing socialist thought. Every field of art, literature, science, music, education, or industry, is feeling the influence of that thought. A delegate from the recent meeting of the National Educational Association at Detroit states that the whole proceedings swung round a contrast between the new pedagogical theory, demanding educational advance and growth, and the capitalist environment that cramped and deadened all things educational.

The populist party is today but a memory so far as a political organization is concerned. But the impulse which once led to the casting of a million votes in blind protest against a galling capitalism is becoming more intelligently revolutionary. The suffering of the American farmer during the past ten years, together with the lessons of general economic development, have made the farmers of America ready for socialism. But the socialists are not yet ready for the farmers. The majority of socialist writers and speakers are so hopelessly ignorant of the problems of agriculture that they cannot possibly have an intelligent opinion upon them. Yet they are

anxious to write farmers' programs and to give voice to farmers' demands. Many a socialist talks learnedly of the problems of agriculture from the depths of a city office who not only knows nothing of practical farming, but would be hard put to it if asked to name a single periodical or book on agriculture. If such men will first study the needs and demands of the farmer they will find that he is simply making, in a more or less intelligent form, the age-long demand of the slave, that he receive what he produces and that he possess in common with his fellows the tools with which that product is created.

The great body of trade-unionists, too, through the formation of trusts, issuance of injunctions, and use of militia, are being forced to recognize the necessity of independent political action to secure common possession of the essentials to life. When they have recognized this fact they are socialists. The labor fakir is losing his grip all along the line. Capitalist politicians are being driven from the unions. Active socialists in the trade-unions are hastening this process at a multitude of points.

Within the political parties all is chaos. In the height of its power the republican party is panic-stricken lest its old dummy adversary disintegrate and give way to a real antagonist. Hanna shrieks out that the next struggle will be between republicans and socialists. Wayne MacVeagh repeats the same statement in more guarded language. The leading spokesmen and writers of the republican party hover round the fading form of their dearest enemy and urge the "reorganization" of the democratic party, and hail with joy all signs of reviving strength. But the case is hopeless. The economic class whose interests were represented by the democratic party has ceased to be of sufficient importance to be hereafter represented in the political world. Therefore, that party has ceased to exist save as a disgusting memory that one would fain put aside and out of mind. From the old party organizations of Ohio, New York and Illinois, as well as from countless individuals comes the proof that since the class of little exploiters has disappeared, there is nothing left for the professional politician save to choose between the proletariat and the capitalist class. But the vultures flock only where carrion calls, and proletarian bones have already been picked too clean by the hyenas of capitalism to invite the visits of the foul birds of politics. So all these, whether formerly democratic or republican, try to cling to plutocracy. Neither one sees anything to be gained by espousing the cause of the workers. And they are right, for he who comes to the proletariat of today can rob him of nothing but his fetters.

Millions in America today have been prepared by economic development for acceptance and understanding of the principles of socialism. But the socialists, who should be spending every energy in bringing those principles before the people who are ready, are wasting their time in child-like wrangling. The time is now here for action. If we who are in possession of the machinery of socialist

political parties have not intelligence enough to adjust that machinery to accommodate the new elements that are ready for socialism, then those elements will form a political machinery of their own and we will be forced to accept their work. This will mean perhaps years of costly blundering and human suffering, as unnecessary as cruel and costly.

One thing is certain. This fiercely fomenting new wine demands new bottles. A mighty social upheaval, a great political party, an economic revolution cannot be confined within the bounds of a fraternal society for propaganda purposes. The greatest need of the hour is not, as in the past, a training school for propagandists, so much as a political expression of the movement that is already at hand. Questions of dues, officers, constitutions, and membership, must give way to the larger facts of economic exigency and social evolution. The current of revolution has grown too broad in America to be confined within the limits of any lodge-like organization, and any attempt to so confine it will fail with disaster to those who make the effort, as well as to the socialist cause. This does not mean that officers, dues and constitutions are not necessary, for they are of great importance. Those who would seek to dispense with such essentials are emptying out the baby with the bath. But from now on these things must be looked upon as merely means to an end, and not always the most important means. This is not a question of choice. It will not be by vote, but by social development that this condition will come to pass. When socialism shall have begun to spread into every nook and corner of the country, when nominations are made in legal primaries by voters whose qualifications are determined by capitalist law, when success shall have given us the responsibility for official actions as well as the work of propaganda, when, in short, we shall have become a political and social force instead of a mere educational cult, then the fundamental change will have come no matter whether we have had sense enough to realize it and accommodate the forms of our organization to it or not.

Purity of economic doctrine can no longer be secured through party discipline. The time is even now here when the attempt to uproot economic heresy by personal expulsions becomes the broadest of burlesques. The purity of socialist principles must henceforth be maintained by the burning away of all dross in the heat of free discussion. The right and true must be made to triumph because of their logical power to conquer and not because of the support of party discipline. This demands the greatest freedom of personal discussion and action within the party. At a time when the socialists were but a chosen few in a hostile land, when the corrupting influence of capitalism beat ceaselessly upon each individual from every side, then it was perhaps necessary that those principles be intrusted to the few who would protect them from contamination and preserve their purity. So long, too, as there were confusing, but still powerful, economic classes with conflicting interests, there was pressing

danger from those who would steal from the socialist armory a portion of its weapons only to bend them into forms that could be used against their rightful owners. But today, when socialists have left their sectarian seclusion to take the offensive upon the field of battle, and when development has progressed to the point where there is no class or party that can afford to accept a portion of the socialist logic, lest they be at once compelled to take the whole, this danger is no longer imminent. If today such a party is allowed to grow up and to act as an obstacle for a few years to the progress of revolutionary socialism it will be because the organized socialists have not recognized the changes of economic development and have sulked in cowardly seclusion within their tents while those of perhaps less knowledge of socialist principles but more courage of their convictions and greater grasp of present social movements have dared to act, even if unwisely.

Once more "it is a condition not a theory that confronts us." The socialist movement has already outgrown the reach of party discipline. With the hundred independent socialist papers of today grown into a thousand in a year hence, any press censorship becomes as impossible and as ineffective as personal expulsions. We grow, not because we will it, but because we are alive and obey the laws of growth.

Any organization that shall correspond to present exigencies must possess great flexibility. The socialists of no other time or place were ever confronted with such a task—nor such an opportunity—as that which now lies before the socialists of America. It is more nearly comparable to the international problems that have confronted the socialists of Europe than to any questions that have ever arisen within national boundaries. It is even more difficult and more significant than any international question, for in the last analysis all such problems could be solved by cutting the Gordian knot of international connection and leaving each nation free to solve its own problems. But political and economic relations force us to accept the fact of national unity, and it is but the part of a coward or a fool to refuse to recognize this fact. History, tradition, political practice and economic solidarity demand that there be but one national socialist party and any discussion of anything else is an idle waste of breath which may for the moment obstruct the coming of such a party, but cannot prevent its ultimate appearance and success. Whether that one party will come as the result of intelligent co-operation or as a survival after a bitter fratricidal struggle is for the socialists of America to decide.

But if there is national unity local diversity is no less a fact. There is as great variation in economic conditions between Maine, S. Carolina, New York, Mississippi, Illinois, Florida, Dakota and California, as between Germany, Belgium, France, Norway, Italy and Spain. Yet, as was said before, there must be an organic unity and not a federation of independent, isolated groups extending over the

entire United States. To talk of anything else betrays an ignorance of American political, social and governmental institutions too dense for argument to penetrate. The ideal must be complete state autonomy in local affairs with closest national co-operation in all affairs, and national control of national affairs. This ideal can be realized through the establishment of a central control that shall be almost entirely advisory and educational in its character and that shall secure obedience to its decrees only because of the possession of wider knowledge of the things on which it speaks.

Under the conditions of the future the maintenance of a membership in a dues-paying organization will be rather a mark of greater activity for socialism than a test of socialist orthodoxy. The party machinery will be an instrument of co-ordination and communication, not of discipline and regulation.

The whole attitude of the socialist movement from now on must be one of attack upon the entire capitalist organization at every point of opening. We must "bore from within" and strike from without. Let us become conscious of our strength. Let us lay aside utopianism in all its forms. Let us maintain the purity of our doctrines by striking them continually against the weapons of our adversaries that all unessential matter may be jarred away. Let us not fear contamination by contact with capitalism. Let us rather draw close to every old and decaying social institution, that, while preserving our identity we may strike the harder blow. This does not mean the slightest concession to Fabianism, compromise or fusion. We must always and at all times preserve the class-conscious position, maintain our independence and abate no jot of our principles. The evolution of the ages has justified the truth of those principles and every passing day emphasizes their truth. Today no man dare openly challenge the fundamental principles of scientific socialism. No man has challenged them for many years. Why, then, should we fear injury to them in closest comparison with the exploded positions of the defenders of capitalism?

We have nothing to gain from half-way measures, save delay to complete victory. Economic evolution in America has wiped out all stepping stones between capitalism and socialism and he who fears to take the whole leap will but fall into the abyss that separates them.

Two contending forces are struggling for the mastery in the socialist movement of America at this moment. One sees only this new phase of economic development and that the old institutions of socialism do not correspond to the new demands. They would wipe out all the work of years and surrender all to the exigencies of the moment. These men would abolish national organizations, and, indeed, all organization, and enter the field of capitalist politics to scramble for votes through the competitive offers of immediate amelioration. The other force remembers only the good work of the past and fails to recognize that new forces are here. They would seek to maintain a secular church, a doctrinaire seclusion, and a personal discipline. Let us

apply the Hegelian dialectics that in a modified form lie back of the earliest socialist classics, and seek the solution in a higher synthesis, that shall conserve the old and include the new,—that shall maintain principles intact, but shall give the greatest flexibility of form. If we can do this we shall have solved the problem that lay before us and acquitted ourselves like men and women and socialists.

Professor Emile Vinck will arrive in New York about the first of September with the purpose of making a lecture tour across the country as far west as arrangements can be made. Professor Vinck is a member of the faculty of the "New University" in Brussels, the most important socialist educational institution in the world. He is also the secretary of the Federation of Socialist Municipal Councillors of Belgium, and is without doubt the greatest living authority on socialist activity in municipalities. He speaks either French, English or German with equal ease, and is a fluent and eloquent speaker. He has made several short lecture tours throughout England, and the English comrades and the press agree in praising him as an instructive, enthusiastic speaker. We can say of our personal knowledge that there are few men in the socialist movement today who can speak in a more authoritative and interesting manner than Comrade Vinck. All that he asks is his expenses, including entertainment and railroad fare from the preceding town. He will certainly come as far west as Chicago, and as much further as arrangements can be readily made. Until the party reorganization is completed and the proper officials elected to take charge of his tour, all arrangements can be made through the *International Socialist Review*. Any towns where there is to be a municipal election should not miss this opportunity. Professor Vinck is accustomed to out-door propaganda in Belgium, and writes us that he is as willing to speak out of doors as in.



PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Collectivism and Industrial Evolution

Every active socialist knows that when he gets an intelligent man or woman once really interested, the first question is likely to be: "What book is there that explains just what socialists want and how they propose to get it?"

Up to now this has been a really embarrassing question. We have had plenty of good booklets, each covering some special phase of the subject, and plenty of books proving the injustice of capitalism and the impossibility of its surviving, but we have had no one book covering the whole field, and it has been particularly hard to find any scientific treatment of the necessary transition from capitalism to socialism.

The very book that is needed is now offered in Vandervelde's *Collectivism*. The first part of the book is devoted to capitalist concentration. With a wealth of illustrations from many lands he shows how personal ownership of the tools of production by the people who use them has become a thing of the past and how the trust, all over the civilized world, is becoming more and more the dominant form of industry. Before leaving this branch of the subject he analyses the cases cited by such writers as Bernstein to show the persistence of a middle class in certain lines of work, and he proves that the exceptions to the law of concentration are apparent rather than real.

The second part of the book is on the socialization of the means of pro-

duction and exchange. The author begins by showing the utter weakness of the classic arguments for profit when applied to the profits of the modern stockholder in a great corporation. Then follows an exhaustive chapter on the advantages of social property; then one showing that "the administration of things" rather than the control of persons, would be the function of the state under socialism. Next comes a chapter on formulas of distribution which faces the difficult question of adjusting the rewards of labor to the work and to the needs of the workers and the helpless members of society. The means of realization are then considered, and the author explains the relative advantages and disadvantages of expropriating the capitalists with indemnity, without indemnity, or with a limited indemnity. In the final chapter the various objections of socialism, old and new, are answered in a way that is simply crushing.

The whole book is a masterpiece of propaganda. It contains the results of important studies that the best informed socialist cannot afford to miss, and yet it is easy reading for any intelligent student of the subject, even for one who has never before opened a socialist book.

"COLLECTIVISM" contains 199 pages and is published in cloth, uniform with Liebknecht's *Life of Marx*, at 50 cents, also in paper at 25 cents, postpaid.

ADDRESS

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY (Co-operative) 56 Fifth Ave., Chicago

The Principles of Social Progress.

Rev. William Thurston Brown, of Rochester, N. Y., whose name is familiar to all readers of the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW*, writes as follows :

"James Bale Morman, A. B., of this city, has written a book entitled 'The Principles of Social Progress,' which brings to mind Henry Demarest Lloyd's declaration that 'we are in the rapids of a new era.' Many thinking men agree with this statement. They discern an industrial and social awakening. They perceive changes that have taken place within a century—changes that have been peaceful and silent, coming almost without observation. Following closely upon these developments there has come a sociological literature, and to this literature Mr. Morman has made a worthy addition in his book. A considerable number of the pamphlets and books which have been written during the past decade or two have tended more to obscure than to illuminate the subject, affording a shallow and misleading treatment. Mr. Morman has given to the public a conspicuously clear, judicial and thoughtful treatise. His book implies a remarkable breadth of intellectual grasp upon the subject, together with original research, wide reading and careful thinking. And it is written in the best of diction. It is one of the few essentially scientific treatments of the social problem, and it is doubtful if an equally broad survey of history and biology in their relation to social evolution can be found in print within the scope of 240 pages. The institutions of society and government are traced back to their biological origin, and then the direction in which social development is tending and the way of intelligent co-operation with those elemental tendencies are shown with great clearness and cogency of argument. It is the work of an optimist, but of one whose optimism rests upon the secure basis of extensive study, profound thought and clear reasoning. Very few books dealing with the burning questions of the day are so well suited as this to meet the needs of such a wide variety of readers. It is a distinctly patriotic service that Mr. Morman has rendered, and no one will lay this book down after a careful reading without a sense of obligation to its author."

"The Principles of Social Progress" is a book of 200 pages, printed in clear type on extra paper and bound in a style equal to books usually sold at \$1.00. By special arrangement with the author we can send it postpaid to any address for 50 cents. We do not publish it and our lowest price to stockholders is 48 cents by mail or 35 cents at this office. Address

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, 56 Fifth Ave., Chicago.

THE SILVER CROSS

OR

THE CARPENTER OF NAZARETH

By **Eugene Sue**

PREFACE

Eugene Sue wrote in French a monumental work: "The Mysteries of the People," or "History of a Proletarian Family." It is a "work of fiction," yet it is the best universal history extant: better than any work, avowedly on history, it graphically traces the special features of the several systems of class-rule as they have succeeded each other from epoch to epoch, together with the nature of the struggle between the contending classes. The "Law," "Order," "Patriotism," "Religion," etc., etc., that each successive tyrant class, despite its change of form, hysterically sought refuge in to justify its criminal existence whenever threatened; the varying economic causes of the oppression of the toilers; the mistakes incurred by these in their struggles for redress; the varying fortunes of the conflict—all these social dramas are therein reproduced in a majestic series of "historic novels," covering leading and successive episodes in the history of the race.

The work here published in English garb is one of these historic novels. It is chosen because of its singular fitness to modern times in one important respect: the unity of action of the oppressors, despite hostile politico-material interests and clashing religious views: the hypocrisy that typifies them all; the oneness of fundamental purpose that animates pulpit, professional chair or public office in possession of a plundering class; and, last but not least, the identity of the methods pursued and the pretences seized by the plundering and ruling class, at that long ago critical period in the history of the human race, when the pre-feudal Colossus of the Roman Empire was, by force of its own power, beginning to strangle itself, and, at the present or third critical period, when the grandchild of that Roman system and child of FEUDALISM—CAPITALISM—is now in turn, likewise by virtue of its own ripened colossal power, throttling itself to death, and, with its death throes, heralding the advent of a new civilization—the SOCIALIST SOCIAL SYSTEM.

"The Silver Cross," or "The Carpenter of Nazareth," is a pathetic page from history that holds the mirror up to the Capitalist Class—its orators, pulpiteers, politicians, lawyers, together with all its other menials of high and low degree, and by the reflection cast, enlightens and warns.

151 pages, cloth, with or without "Silver Cross" decoration

PRICE 50c

Can be had at all socialist locals and booksellers, or from the publishers.

A descriptive catalogue may be had on request.

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY PUBLISHING CO., 23 Duane St., New York City

ANNOUNCEMENT

To Our Patrons:

We have bought out the entire pamphlet department of the International Library Publishing Co., 23 Duane Street, New York. The purchase includes the entire stock of pamphlets, plates and copyrights and embraces the following high-grade publications:

Socialism and Slavery —Answer to Herbert Spencer's Attack on Socialism—By H. M. Hyndman.....	5c
What Socialism Means —By Sidney Webb, LL. B.....	5c
What Is Capital? —By Ferdinand Lassalle ...	5c
Real Socialism —What Socialism is and what it is not—By Robert Blatchford	5c
Socialism —A Reply to the Pope's Encyclical—By Robert Blatchford.	5c
The Living Wage —By Robert Blatchford.....	5c
A Socialist View of Religion and the Churches —By Tom Mann....	5c
The Object of the Labor Movement —By Johann Jacoby.....	5c
The State and Socialism —By Gabriel Deville.....	10c
Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism —By Gabriel Deville...	10c
The Workingman's Programme —By Ferdinand Lassalle.....	10c
Open Letter —To the National Labor Association of Germany—By Ferdinand Lassalle.....	10c
The Right to be Lazy —A refutation of "The Right to Work" of 1848—By Paul Lafargue.....	10c
Wage-Labor and Capital —By Karl Marx; introduction by Frederick Engels	10c
Science and the Workingmen —By Ferdinand Lassalle.....	25c
The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte —By Karl Marx; with Marx's portrait as frontpiece.....	25c
The Civil War in France —By Karl Marx; introduction by Frederick Engels	25c

To all socialist branches, agents and speakers ordering in quantities, we will make a liberal discount.

We will make the complete set of above pamphlets (17) to one address, prepaid, for \$1.25.

Address

DEBS PUBLISHING CO.
TERRE HAUTE, IND.